ON THE

PROSODIES

OF THE

GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGES.

———Graiis dedit ore rotundo
Muſa loqui———

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. NICHOLS,
FOR J. ROBSON, NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCXCVI.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

EDWARD LORD THURLOW.

My dear Lord,

YOU are perhaps one of very few, who, if you think it worth while to look into the enſuing Treatiſe, will immediately diſcover the hand of the writer. Although I wiſh, at preſent, to be concealed, I cannot perſuade myſelf to ſend this Tract abroad, without an acknowledgement, which perhaps may betray me, of how much my mind has

has been informed, and my own opinions upon this ſubject have been confirmed, by converſations, which many things in this Eſſay, will bring to your recollection. At the ſame time, it contains many notions, which are perhaps peculiar to myſelf; in the error of which, if they ſhould be found erroneous, notwithſtanding our agreement in ſome firſt principles, it is not to be underſtood, that your Lordſhip is, in any degree, implicated.

Were I to form a wiſh for my country, it ſhould be, that your Lordſhip might again be called to take part in her councils; where you would diſplay that wiſdom, firmneſs of principle, and integrity, with which you ſo long adorned one of the higheſt public ſtations. A

better

better wiſh perhaps for you may be, that you may enjoy many years of learned leiſure. I am, my Lord, with the moſt cordial attachment and eſteem,

Your Lordſhip's much obliged,

and faithful Friend,

and obedient ſervant,

The AUTHOR.

ON THE

PROSODIES

OF THE

GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGES.

THE word PROSODY, in the modern uſe of it, is a name for that part of the art of Grammar, which teaches to diſtinguiſh the metrical quantities of ſyllables, and lays down the rules for ſcanning verſe. But this reſtricted ſenſe of the word was unknown to the antient Grammarians.

By προσῳδίαι the Greek Grammarians meant certain marks placed over, or ſometimes between, letters; to direct the reader in the modulation of his voice. All ſuch marks are called by the Greeks προσῳδίαι; by the

Latins, "*Notæ*, *Moderamenta*, *Accentus*, *Accentiunculæ*, *Voculationes*."

The Greek Grammarians reckoned ten of theſe Προσῳδίαι, or Marks, namely, two of Time; the long ¯, and the ſhort ˘: three of Tone; the acute ´, the grave `, and the circumflex ˜: two of Aſpiration, the ſtronger ', and the weaker ': three of Paſſions of words, *Apoſtrophus*, *Hyphen*, and *Hypodiaſtole*.

By the Paſſions of words they underſtood thoſe changes, which certain words undergo, for the ſmoothneſs of enunciation in proſe, or for accommodation to the laws of metre in verſe. Theſe, in the Greek language, are chiefly three.

Firſt, The Eliſion of either of the four vowels α, ε, ο, ι, at the end of a word, when the next begins with a vowel. The abſence of the final vowel was marked by an *Apoſtrophus* placed over the conſonant preceding; thus, ἄρ' for ἄρα, φέρ' for φέρε, τοῦτ' for τοῦτο, ἐπ' for ἐπὶ. The poets ſometimes apoſtrophized the two dipthongs αι and οι.

Secondly, the running of two words into one in the pronunciation; which was marked by the *Hyphen*, thus, το-πρῶτον, την-ἀρχὴν. The *Hyphen* is now totally diſuſed, ſuch words being printed as one, τοπρῶτον and τηναρχὴν.

τηναρχὴν. It ſhould ſeem from a paſſage in Quintilian*, that, in the Latin language, a prepoſition, if it came immediately before the word it governed, or an adjective in appoſition with that word, was always united to the word immediately following, ſo as to make but one word in the enunciation; and the caſe was probably the ſame, with the oxytonized prepoſitions at leaſt, in the Greek. Thus *circum littora* was read *circumlittora*, and *circum piſcóſos ſcópulos* was read *circumpiſcóſos ſcópulos*, and "*áb óris*" was read "*abóris.*"

The third Paſſion of words in the Greek language was the ſeparation of a word, made of two, into its conſtituent parts by the *Hypodiaſtole*, thus, ὅ, τι; τό, τε.

Such Paſſions of words are very different in different languages. They are very numerous in the French language, and the variety of marks, that ſhould expreſs them all, would be endleſs. But of the ten Προσῳδίαι of the Greeks, the three firſt, Time, Tone, and Spirit, belong to all languages; being neceſſary adjuncts of articulate ſpeech, inherent in the very nature of the thing. For every ſound muſt take ſome time, longer

* Lib. I. c. v.

or ſhorter; and muſt be uttered in ſome tone, higher or lower; and every initial vowel muſt be accompanied with a ſtronger or a weaker breathing. About the Spirits there is no difficulty. But Time and Tone, Quantity and Accent, and the relations of the one to the other make a ſubject of ſome intricacy, and in this country not well underſtood.

It is a peculiarity of the Engliſh language, that Quantity and Accent always go together; the longeſt ſyllable, in almoſt every word, being that, on which the accent falls. By the habit of our pronunciation we generally lengthen the ſound of the accented ſyllable, and the voice runs rapidly over all the other ſyllables of the word; and, we have no other rule of quantity, but to lengthen the ſound of the accented ſyllable; nor of accentuation in poetry, but to give the ſharp ſtroke of the voice upon the ſyllable, which, by its place in the verſe, ought to be long. If in ſome words we give the acute accent, without lengthening the ſyllable on which it falls, an attentive ear will perceive, that all the ſyllables of thoſe words are ſhort, as hŏnĕy, mŏnĕy, clĕvĕrlў, lŭckĭlў. In certain verbs, indeed, of three or more ſyllables, the

the accent is uſually given upon the antepenult; which yet, though longer than the penult, is not ſo long as the final ſyllable; as *grátify*, *mágnify*, *récompenſe*. But the accenting of theſe words upon the antepenult is a novel practice. According to the old rule of our language, the accent was upon the laſt ſyllable. Our grandfathers ſaid, not *grátify*, *mágnify*, *récompenſe*, *&c.* but *gratify̆*, *magnify̆*, *recompẽnſe*. According to the genuine pronuntiation of our language, to which there are ſtill but few exceptions, acuteneſs of tone, and length of time generally coincide, and never are ſeparated. But the rules of accent were much more complex, both in the Latin and in the Greek languages; and ſtill more ſo in the Hebrew, if the Rabbinical ſyſtem of punctuation gives the true pronunciation of that language, which is indeed very queſtionable; and for this in particular, among many reaſons, that if the Hebrew language had all that nicety in its pronunciation, which the Maſoretic points exhibit; it ſeems almoſt impoſſible, that men ſhould ever have thought of writing it, as it certainly was antiently written, without vowels in the far greater part.

The Greek grammarians make uſe of three marks, as has been already obſerved, to expreſs, as it may ſeem at firſt ſight, three different tones of the voice; the Acute, or Sharp ´; the Grave, or Flat `; and the Circumflex ˜. But, upon a nearer conſideration of the ſubject, it appears, that the Acute, which is a ſharp ſtroke of the voice upon ſome one ſyllable of the word, is in truth the only poſitive tone. The Grave conſiſts merely in a negation of that acuteneſs. For the general doctrine of accents is, that, with the exception of fourteen monoſyllables in the Greek language, which carry no accent, except in particular circumſtances, and for that reaſon are called ἄτονοι; ſome one ſyllable of every word, and one ſyllable only, bears an accent, either an acute, or a circumflex. The grave accent is not marked, except it be upon the laſt ſyllable of certain words; but it is to be underſtood, as grammarians ſay, upon every ſyllable of the word which carries neither the acute nor the circumflex; which ſeems to amount to no more than this, that what they call the grave tone conſiſts in a mere negation of acuteneſs; and of circumflexion, if that be a different thing from acuteneſs.

The

The word βαρύτης naturally indeed ſignifies a depreſſion of the voice below its general or or ordinary level; as ὀξύτης ſignifies a riſe of the voice above its general level; and, in this ſenſe the word was uſed by the writers upon Muſic. But in ſpeaking, we are told by grammarians, that every ſyllable of a word was grave, except that one which carried the acute accent. Now, in ſpeech it is no leſs impoſſible, that the voice ſhould be ſunk below, than it ſhould be raiſed above its general key, for many ſyllables together; or, in other words, the tone of voice, which was common to every ſyllable of every word ſave one, was no other than the midling key. The Grave tone, therefore, in common ſpeech is nothing but this mean level of the voice; which is called grave, in relation only to the acute, of which it is the meer negation. The words that are marked with the grave accent upon the final ſyllable, are called Oxytons; for this reaſon, that if ſuch a word was to be uttered ſingly, by itſelf, an acute accent was to be given upon the final ſyllable; naturally, therefore, ſuch words were what the name imports, Oxytons. But, whenever theſe words occurred with other words

in ſentences, the acute accent was ſuppreſſed; except the Oxyton ſtood next before an enclitic, or at the end of a ſentence: and the effect of the grave mark was to denote that ſuppreſſion of the accent, and to ſignify to the reader, that a perfect monotony, or level of the voice, was to be preſerved, in ſounding the ſyllables of that word. For which reaſon Laſcaris ſays that this grave accent was not *properly* but ſyllabically only a tone; by which he ſeems to mean, that it expreſſed, not any particular tone of the ſyllable upon which it was placed, but the equality of tone upon all the ſyllables of the word. Τόπος τῆς βαρείας, εἷς· ἡ λήξουσα. καὶ πᾶσα δὲ λέξις αὐτὴν δεχομένη καθ' ὁμαλισμὸν ἀναγινώσκεσθαι. ἔστι δὲ τόνος συλλαβικῶς, καὶ ὁ κυρίως. p. 165

He had ſaid before πᾶσα γὰρ ὀνομαστικὴ καὶ αἰτιατικὴ ἀσυναίρετος, καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὀξύνεσθαι· ἐν δὲ τῇ συνεπείᾳ, ἀντὶ τῆς ὀξείας, βαρεῖαν ἐπιδέχεσθαι. This ὁμαλισμὸς, of which Laſcaris ſpeaks, will be eaſily underſtood by thoſe, who are well acquainted with the pronunciation of the French language, which abounds with ſuch monotonous words. It was unknown to the Latins in their own language, and we have little of it. p. 165

The

The grave accent, therefore, of the Greeks was nothing more than a negation of acuteneſs, and of circumflexion. But circumflexion, ſo far as it was accent, was an acute accent *. The Circumflex was nothing more than a compound of the mark of the acute accent ´ with the mark of a long quantity –. It was probably originally expreſſed by the two ſtrait lines joined together thus ⌐; and this ſtiff mark was changed into the curve ~, partly for the convenience of writing expeditiouſly, and partly, perhaps, for the greater elegance of the ſhape. Long ſyllables only could bear a circumflex; and this compound mark expreſſed, that the ſyllable was to be pronounced both with a ſharp ſtroke, and a lengthened ſound. It was of great importance, that this circumſtance ſhould be ſuggeſted to the reader's attention by a diſtinct mark; becauſe the natural tendency of the acute accent, contrary to the prejudice of the Engliſh ear, is to ſhorten the time of the ſyllable on which it falls; eſpecially of the laſt ſyllable of a word, and of the penult, the two ſeats of the Circumflex. The reader, therefore, was to be put upon his guard, when the

* ——eadem flexa, et acuta." Quinctil. lib. I. c. v.

acute

acute tone fell upon either of theſe ſyllables being long, not to ſuffer any acceleration of his voice, a natural, but by no means a neceſſary effect of the acute accent, to take place in violation of quantity.

The Acute, therefore, appears in truth to be the only Accent, or Tone, properly ſo called, the Grave being merely a negation of acuteneſs, and the Circumflex being a compound mark of accent and quantity jointly, an acute accent and a long quantity. This at leaſt is the account of the Circumflex given by Sextus Empiricus *, who probably took it from Dionyſius Thrax, a celebrated grammarian of the times of Pompey the Great, whoſe authority, upon points of grammar, Sextus Empiricus profeſſes to follow. In Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis too we have a deſcription of the Circumflex, which, though it differs from this in words, is in effect the ſame. The Halicarnaſſian ſays, that the Circumflex was a mixture of the grave with the acute tone upon one and the ſame ſyllable †. The caſe is, that when the

* ——ἀδύναλον περισπωμένην βραχεῖαν γινέσθαι, διὰ τὸ τῷ περισπασμῷ καὶ ἀνάγκην συνυφίςασθαι τὴν ἐπίτασιν. Sextus Emp. adverſ. Math. lib. i. c. 5.

† ——τῶν δὲ [λεξέων] ἀμφοτέρας τὰς τάσεις ἴχνεσῶν, αἱ μὲν, καθ' μίαν συλλαβὴν συνεφθαρμένον ἴχνει τῷ ὀξεῖ τὸ βαρὺ, ἃς δὴ περισπωμένας καλοῦμεν. Dion. Hal. περὶ συνθέσ: §. 11.

found

ſound of the acute ſyllable is prolonged to the extreme length, the voice muſt of neceſſity ſink to its ordinary level, at the end of the lengthened ſound, before it begins to ſound the next ſyllable. This return of the voice to its level, this dying away of the acute tone, Dionyſius deſcribes as a mixture of it with the grave. Another deſcription of the Circumflex occurs in a Compendium of the rules of Grammar aſcribed by ſome, perhaps without ſufficient evidence, to Dionyſius Thrax, but unqueſtionably a work of high antiquity, and of great credit among the antients. This writer deſcribes the Circumflex, as accompanied with a *ſtoppage* or *ſuffocation* of the ſound*. Under this image he expreſſes the dying away of the acute tone, upon the end of the lengthened ſound; and he borrows a term of art from the writers upon Muſic, which they apply to a flute prepared, by a particular proceſs, to give very low notes. The three definitions are perfectly equivalent; but that of Sextus Empiricus is much the plaineſt, and the moſt

* Τόνος ἐστὶ φωνῆς ἀπήχημα ἐναρμόνιον, ἢ καλὰ ἀνάβασιν ἐν τῇ ὀξείᾳ, ἢ καλὰ ὁμαλισμὸν ἐν τῇ βαρείᾳ, ἢ καλὰ περίπλασιν ἐν τῇ περισπωμένῃ. Vide ſcriptoris cujuſdam perantiqui, Dionyſii Thracis vulgo crediti, Artem Grammaticam Gr. apud Fabricium Biblioth. Tom. VII. p. 26. Confer Quinctilian. Inſtitut. Lib. I. c. xi.

directly

directly and perſpicuouſly expreſſive of the formal nature of the thing.

It is unneceſſary to enter into a minute detail of the rules of accentuation, which have been delivered with great accuracy and preciſion by Dr. Buſby, and other grammarians. The deſign of this Eſſay is not to teach the particular rules of placing accent, but to explain, in what manner pronunciation is to be governed by them, when they are rightly placed; and, for this purpoſe, it will be ſufficient to recollect the moſt general laws of accentuation, ariſing from the very nature of tone and time, independent of all arbitrary uſage; and to point out certain changes, which, by virtue of thoſe very laws, the accents of detached words would often undergo, in particular connections and arrangements, eſpecially in verſe.

In the Greek language a great number of words (for what reaſon it is not eaſy to diſcover), had an acute accent upon the laſt ſyllable, and are called Oxytons. But their acute accent is never to be given by the voice, unleſs upon the detached word, or when the word ſtands the laſt in a ſentence, or next before an enclitic. In connection with

with other words they are to be uttered, as has been obſerved, with the voice upon one unvaried level; except when they are followed immediately by an enclitic, which may revive the acute accent upon the final ſyllable. The laſt ſyllable of theſe Oxytons is marked not with the acute, but with the grave mark.

Many words are circumflexed upon the laſt ſyllable; but this can only happen when the quantity of the laſt ſyllable is long; for no other than a long ſyllable can take a circumflex. Theſe are called περισπωμένα, Circumflexed words.

In words that are neither oxytons nor circumflexed, the ſeat of the accent muſt be either the penult or antepenult; for if a word conſiſt of ever ſo many ſyllables, the accent cannot be thrown farther back than to the third ſyllable from the end. If the final ſyllable of the word be long, the acute accent muſt be laid upon the penult, whatever the quantity of the penult itſelf may be. The penult often receives an acute accent, when the final ſyllable is ſhort, provided the penult itſelf be ſhort too. And all words carrying an acute accent on the penult, are called Paroxytons. But, if

the final ſyllable being ſhort by nature or uſe, the penult is by nature long; the accent upon the penult, if it takes an accent at all, muſt be the Circumflex; and words circumflexed on the penult are called προπερισπωμένα, Antecircumflexed.

When the final ſyllable of a word of many ſyllables is ſhort, the acute accent may be laid upon the antepenult, whatever the quantity either of the antepenult itſelf, or the penult, may be. Words accented on the antepenult are called Proparoxytons. The antepenult never takes the circumflex. It is difficult to aſſign a reaſon for this prohibition, unleſs it was this. Though all long ſyllables are generally eſteemed equal, yet, in the nature of things, there is a difference in the time of different long ſyllables, to which the Greeks were not inattentive. The circumflexed ſyllable was always a long ſyllable of the extreme length; and though the antepenult often takes an acute accent, when it is at the ſame time a long ſyllable, yet it was inconſiſtent with the melody of ſpeech, according to the nice perceptions of the Greek ear, that the ſound of it ſhould be prolonged to the extreme length marked by the circumflex. That the

Greeks

Greeks obſerved a difference of length in their long ſyllables, appears from the diſtinction mentioned by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis between ſyllables perfectly long, and imperfectly long. He ſays that it was a maxim with the writers upon Rhythm, that the long ſyllable of a true dactyl was ſhorter than a perfect long ſyllable; how much ſhorter they could not tell, and therefore they called it ἄλογος. That there was another triſyllabic, which was the exact reverſe of this; beginning with two ſhort ſyllables, and ending in an ἄλογος; and, that to diſtinguiſh this inverted dactyl from an anapæſt, in which the final ſyllable of the foot was of the perfect length, they gave it the name of Κύκλος*. It is to be remarked, however, that, in verſification theſe rules were not very nicely obſerved; for many of Homer's dactyls begin with a ſyllable of the perfect length, and κύκλοι often occur in the anapæſts of the tragedians.

———Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων. Apud Homerum paſſim.

Μῆνιν ἄειδε———

Οὐδ' ὅτε πρὶν λοιμοῖο βαρείας χεῖρας ἀφέξει.

Il. A. 97.

* Dionyſ. περὶ Συνθεσ. c. 17.

Φεῦγε

Φεῦγε μάλ'—— Il. A. 173.

ΜΕΓΑΛΟΙ | ΘΟΡΥΒΟΙ | καλέχυσ' | ἡμᾶς
Soph. Ajax. 142.

Χ' ἡμεῖς | ἐδὲν | ΣΘΕΝΟΜΕΝ | πρὸς ταῦτ'
——165.

Παλαγῆ | ΣΙΝ, ΄ΑΤΕ | πληνῶν | ἀγέλαι
——168.

In the Latin language the rules were what, at firſt ſight, may ſeem more ſimple; but in truth, they were much more imperfect. The rule that the acute accent (the name of *acute* here includes the circumflex; for the circumflex, ſays Quinctilian, was itſelf an acute, clearly agreeing in his notion of it with the account given above from Sextus Empiricus*), the rule that the acute accent was not to be thrown back beyond the antepenult, was common to the Latin with the Greek language. Monoſyllables might be either acute or circumflexed, but never grave, or deſtitute of accent; for every word, ſays Quinctilian, muſt have one acute accent, and none, he adds, more than one†.

*——eadem flexa et acuta." Lib. I. c. v.

† "Eſt autem in omni voce utique acuta, ſed nunquam plus una, nec ultima unquam." Lib. I. c. v.

But,

But, beſide its monoſyllables, and ſome few indeclinables, the Latin language had no oxytons, nor any circumflexed words. Wanting oxytons of more ſyllables than one, their ſpeech was deprived of that variety of ſound, which was produced in the Greek by that monotony of many polyſyllabic words, which Laſcaris deſcribes. In diſſyllables, an accent, either the acute or the circumflex, neceſſarily fell upon the firſt of the two ſyllables of the word; ſince one ſuch muſt be in every word, and in no word (but a monoſyllable) was allowed to be upon the final ſyllable*. In words of more than two ſyllables, the accent, acute or circumflex, was to be placed upon the penult, if the penult was long; but, if the penult was ſhort, the acute accent was to be thrown back upon the antepenult, whatever the quantity either of the antepenult itſelf, or of the final ſyllable, might be†; with an exception, however, made by later grammarians, but with the ſingle exception, of the compoſites of *facio*, *malefácit*, *calefácit*, *benefácit*; in which the penult, though ſhort, took an acute accent.

* Quinctilian in loc. cit. † Ibid. Lib. I. c. v. §. 30.

From this ſummary view of the general rules of accent, in the Greek and Latin languages, it appears, that, in both, the rules of accentuation had regard to the quantity of the ſyllables of every word; not indeed, as with us, to the quantity of that particular ſyllable, on which the accent falls; but of other ſyllables in the word. But neither the Greeks or the Latins entertained the notion, which prevails among us, that the acute accent neceſſarily lengthened the ſound of the ſyllable, upon which it was thrown.

The difference, between the two ſyſtems of the Greeks and the Latins, lay chiefly in four points. Firſt, That, in the collocation of the Accent, the Greeks chiefly attended to the quantity of the final ſyllable of the word; the Latins, to that of the penult. Secondly, The Greek language had innumerable oxytons, and many circumflexed words; the Latin none of either ſort, except monoſyllables, and ſome few indeclinables, which ſeem to make an exception to Quinctilian's general rule of "*ultima nunquam*;" though certainly that exception was later than his time, and is in truth to be conſidered as a corruption. Thirdly, The Greeks often threw the acute accent upon

the penultima of a polyſyllable, even when it was ſhort; the Latins, in that caſe, never. Fourthly, On the other hand, the Latins always threw the acute accent upon the penultima of a polyſyllable, if it was long. The Greeks, on the contrary, allow it, even in that caſe, to be thrown back upon the antepenult, provided the final ſyllable be ſhort.

The two oppoſite rules for the accentuation of words of more than two ſyllables, the Greek rule requiring an acute accent upon the penultima, whatever might be its own quantity, when the final ſyllable was long; and the Latin rule forbidding the penult to be acute, when itſelf was ſhort; ſeem to have been both in ſome degree arbitrary; ſince neither was poſitively inconſiſtent with quantity. The rule of the Greek language, however, was much the beſt conſidered of the two; as it was the beſt calculated for the preſervation of the true Rhythm*, with eaſe to the ſpeaker. This

* By the preſervation of Rhythm is meant the diſtinct marking of the juſt quantity of every ſyllable of every word in the recitation either of verſe or proſe.

will appear, by trying the effect of both ſyſtems in Greek verſe.

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς.

In the word, προσεφη, in this verſe the two firſt ſyllables will be ſhort, whether the acute accent be laid upon the middle ſyllable, according to the Greek, or thrown back upon the firſt, according to the Latin rule; provided the reader is careful to give the ſhort ο and ε with their true powers reſpectively. But he, who, with the Latins, ſhall ſay πρόσεφη, though he may preſerve the brevity of both the ſhort ſyllables προσ- and -ε-, will find it ſomewhat difficult, though not impracticable, not to ſhorten the final long ſyllable -φη. He, on the contrary, who, with the Greeks, ſhall ſay προσέφη, at the ſame time that he will, equally with the other, preſerve the brevity of both the ſhort ſyllables, will find himſelf compelled to give the final ſyllable -φη with its true length of ſound, provided he attend to the true power of the vowel. Again in this line:

Ουλομένην, ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε.

He, who with the Latins, ſhall ſay οὐλόμενην, though he will preſerve the brevity of the

two

two ſyllables -λο- and -μεν-, will find it difficult not to ſhorten the two long ſyllables ου- and -ην; eſpecially the former. But he who, adhering to the rule of the Greeks, ſhall ſay οὐλομένην, will find, that, without any effort, and almoſt in ſpite of himſelf, he will give the ſyllables ου- and -ην in their juſt length. The ſame thing might be ſhewn in innumerable inſtances.

Again with reſpect to the long penult, the Greek rule of throwing the acute accent back upon the antepenult, when the final ſyllable is ſhort, makes the ſhortening of the time of the final ſyllable in recitation a matter, not of mere choice, but almoſt of neceſſity; thus,

Βῆ δ' ἀκέων παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης.

The Greek reader, who ſays πολυφλοίσβοιο, preſerves the Rhythm of the whole word, and makes the laſt ſyllable -ο remarkably ſhort. But the Latiniſing reader, who ſays πολυφλοισσβοῖο, gives the ſyllables -φλοισ- and -σβοι- with the proper length, and may give -ο ſhort; but he will be very apt to lengthen πο-, the initial ſyllable of the word, which is ſhort; and to ſhorten the ſecond, -λυ-, which ought to be long.

From ſuch inſtances, which might be multiplied without end, but will be better underſtood, when the powers of the vowels have been accurately deſcribed, it appears, that the Greek rules of accentuation are much more conducive to the preſervation of the true Rhythm of that language, than the rules of the Latins. And this ſingle obſervation, if there were nothing elſe to ſupport it, might juſtly create a ſuſpicion, that the notion, which for ſome years hath ſo generally obtained, that the melody of the Greek metre is deſtroyed, when it is recited with its own accents, muſt be ill-founded. The Latin ſyſtem, however, is well enough calculated for the Latin language. For the ſuperior advantage of the Greek accentuation diſcovers itſelf chiefly in words of a conſiderable length: And theſe are much fewer in the Latin language, than in the Greek.

We indeed of this country, when we attempt to read either Greek or Latin with the accents, give the accents in our own way. That is to ſay, we always prolong the ſound of the ſyllable, on which the acute accent falls, (though it be not a circumflex,) and drive the voice over all the other ſyllables of the word, with a rapidity which, to any

but

but an Engliſh ear, is ſhocking. At the ſame time, we make no difference in ſound between the long and ſhort vowels; giving every one of them the power, which it ordinarily bears in our own language; which differs, in the powers of the vowels, from every other language upon earth. In this way of ſpeaking, all the quantity of metre, and all the rhythm of proſe, is indeed moſt completely deſtroyed. Long is made ſhort, and ſhort is made long; dactyls and anapæſts are confounded; and the former in heroic verſe often turned into amphibrachs, cretics, bacchii, and antibacchii. Thus in

Arma virumque cano——

as we ſpeak it, the dactyl, *-rūmquĕ că-*, is turned into a cretic, *-rūmquĕ cā-*

Again in

*Rupe ſub aëriâ———*the dactyl, *āĕrĭ-*, becomes, in our recitation, an amphibrach *ăĕrĭ-*

There are few lines, that ſuffer leſs in our mouths, than this

Gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat æquor.

And yet, in this line, the dactyl, *mīcă mĭ-*, we make a cretic, *-mīcă mī-*

In nova fert animus——

here we make the dactyl, *īn nŏvă*, an antibacchius, *īn nōvă*.

Ante mare et terras et quod tegit omnia cælum.

In this line we make the dactyls, *āntĕ mă-* and *quōd tĕgĭt*, the first a cretic, *āntĕ mā-*, and, the second an antibacchius, *quōd tēgĭt*. The learned reader, who attends to these instances, and innumerable others of the same kind, which will occur to him in any hundred lines of Virgil, or any other Latin poet, will perhaps be surprized to discover, that the Latin metre is marred in our pronunciation, as well as the Greek.

Μεγάλοι θόρυβοι κατέχουσ' ἡμᾶς
Επὶ δυσκλείᾳ σὲ τὸν ἱππομανῆ
Λειμῶν' ἐπιβάντ', ὀλέσαι Δαναῶν. Soph. Ajax. 142.

In these lines, if we attempt to give the Greek accent, we make the anapæst, μεγάλοι, an amphibrach, μĕγᾱλοῐ; the next, θόρυβοι, a dactyl, θōρῠβοῐ; the third, κατέχουσ', a bacchius, κατēχῡσ'. The anapæsts, ἐπὶ δυσ-, an antibacchius, ēπῑ δῠσ-; σε τον ἱπ- an antibacchius, σē τōν ἵπ-; ὀλέσαι an amphibrach, ὄλēσᾰι. And, if neglecting the proper accents of the Greek, we read by the Latin accent, which

which is now the uſual way, we make every one of the anapæſts a dactyl. For thus we troll them off the tongue.

Μέγαλοι θόρυβοι κάτεχυσ' ἥμας
Ἔπι δυσκλέιᾳ, σέ τον ἱππόμανη
Λεῖμων' ἔπιβαντ', ὄλεσαι Δάναων.

It happens, that the effect of our manner of pronouncing is much worſe, and more diſagreeable to our own ears, in the Greek poetry, than in the Latin; though, in a greater or a leſs degree, it materially injures the melody of both. The reaſon of the difference ſeems to be this,—That, as the Latins never throw an acute accent upon the penult of a polyſyllable being ſhort, which the Greeks do perpetually, fewer ſyllables, which ought to be ſhortened, are lengthened in our way of ſpeaking, in Latin metre, than in Greek. And beſides, from the ſame cauſe, it ſeldom happens, that our pronunciation vitiates the quantity of the two laſt feet of a Latin Hexameter, which very often are marred by it in Greek; and, as long as the time of theſe two laſt feet is preſerved, the quantities in the preceding part of the verſe are of leſs importance.

Perceiving,

Perceiving, however, that the true ſtructure of the Greek verſe is entirely deſtroyed, in our manner of giving the accents; and not aware, that this is merely the vice of our elocution, and that accent might be ſo given, as not only not to alter and confound, but to be a means of preſerving quantity; we have taken up a notion, that the melody of Greek metre cannot be preſerved, while it is read by its own accents. They are therefore diſregarded; and a practice is adopted of reading Greek verſe with the Latin accent; and this is moſt abſurdly called reading *by quantity*. For the Latin accents, as we give them, are only in a leſs degree than the Greek inconſiſtent with the true quantity; ſtill, ſo given, they are inconſiſtent with it. However, by this practice, the ſound of the verſe, in our mouths, is ſomewhat improved. But we have not ſtopped here. The ear admoniſhes us, when we read aloud, that the Rhythm of the periods of Demoſthenes is not leſs injured, than the melody of Homer's verſe, by the accents as we uſe them. We have ventured, therefore, to conclude, that the Greek accents are as ill-adapted to the proſe of the language, as to its verſe. And it ſeems indeed

indeed not very probable, that any people ſhould have had two pronunciations, eſſentially different, one for proſe, and another for verſe. Indeed it might be expected, that the pronunciation of verſe, by a ſkilful reader, would be more exact and nice, than that of common ſpeech. This is remarkably the caſe in the French language; in which many letters have a very perceptible effect given them in verſe, which, in the negligence of common diſcourſe, are ſmothered and loſt. But that is only, that the rule of pronunciation is more nicely executed in the recitation of verſe, than in talking. Farther than this, the pronunciation in proſe and verſe, in every language, is probably the ſame. We have agreed, therefore, that proſe, as well as verſe, in Greek muſt be read, as we ſay, by quantity; but that is, in truth, by the Latin accent. Having adopted this ſtrange practice, of reading one language by the rules of another, it is not unnatural, that we ſhould wiſh to prove the practice right. To this end it has been obſerved, that the marks of the Greek accents are not to be found in monumental inſcriptions, in the legends upon coins, nor in many of the oldeſt manuſcripts.

Upon

Upon theſe grounds, we have advanced boldly to the concluſion, that the marks of accents, and the whole ſyſtem of Greek accentuation, were the invention of a barbarous age, when the antient pronunciation of the language was loſt, or greatly corrupted.—That they deſerve no attention.—And, to the diſgrace of the literature of this country, the rules of the Greek accents are no longer taught in our public ſchools; and the practice is ſtealing in of printing Greek, without the marks of accent; though no edition of any author has yet come forth, in this undreſs, from the preſs of either of our univerſities.

At what time the marks of the accents firſt were introduced in the writing of the Greek language; whether theſe marks exhibit the true ſpeaking tones of the language, ſuch as were uſed by the Greeks themſelves, when it was a living language, and ſpoken in its purity.—Theſe are two queſtions in ſome meaſure diſtinct, though not altogether unconnected. So far as this they are connected; that if the antiquity of the marks can be proved, the truth of the expreſſion will be almoſt a neceſſary conſequence,

ſequence. But, in another point of view, the two queſtions are diſtinct; namely, that if theſe marks, interpreted as we are taught by grammarians to interpret them, can be proved to give a true repreſentation of the tones of common ſpeech; it is of little importance, when they were invented, or who were the inventors. That inſcriptions, coins, and even MSS. exiſt, in which they are not found, is no good reaſon for the diſuſe of them, if what they expreſs belonged to the language; as the true tones of it certainly did. If nothing is to be admitted into the *picture* of the Greek language, in its preſent ſtate, that was not a part, or an appendage, of its moſt antient alphabet; let us expunge the ſpirits; let us baniſh the characters of the long vowels, and for η write ει, οο for ω, and οι for ῳ; let us lay aſide the uſe of the points, which mark the ſubdiviſions of ſentences; let us make no ſeparation of the words; let us give nothing more, in future editions, but the mere letters of the writer, in their exact order, and leave it to the reader, without any other aſſiſtance, to make words out of the letters, and ſentences out of words. It is certainly to this length, that the argument for the diſuſe of theſe marks, from the

ſuppoſed

ſuppoſed lateneſs of the invention, goes, if it is to be at all admitted.

The truth, however, is, that they were not the invention of ſo late an age, as many ſeem to ſuppoſe. In proof of this, we ſhall not avail ourſelves of a conceſſion, made by the moſt learned of thoſe, who firſt called the authority of theſe marks in queſtion—that they were not later, than the time of Ariſtophanes of Byzantium, who is repreſented by Iſaac Voſſius as the inventor of them. This Ariſtophanes lived about 200 years before the æra of our Lord, not 150 after Ariſtotle. But as this aſſertion, that theſe marks were the invention of Ariſtophanes, ſeems to be in itſelf a mere gueſs, without any hiſtorical evidence to ſupport it; we ſhall take no advantage of the conceſſion, which is implied in it, eſpecially as the modern oppoſers of accented pronunciation ſeem not to agree to it. We ſhall endeavour, by a proceſs of inveſtigation, independent of all conceſſions, to aſcend to ſome certain period, below which the date of the invention cannot poſſibly be placed. We ſhall ſhew the neceſſity of admitting, that the accentual marks expreſs the true tones of the language, though this epoch ſhould fall ſhort of the age

age of Ariſtophanes of Byzantium; at the ſame time that we ſhall produce abundant preſumptive proof of a much earlier uſe of them.

Firſt then, it is certain, that the marks of accent were in uſe in the time of Quinctilian. For we find all the three, the acute, the grave, and the circumflex, mentioned by Quinctilian, and certainly not in the manner, in which any man would mention a new invention. Theſe marks, therefore, were an invention of ſome ſtanding in the time of Quinctilian. And Quinctilian flouriſhed before the year of our Lord 90.

But we go higher. The marks of accent were in common uſe in writing, in the time of Strabo. In his time it was become a diſputed point, whether the town of Ilium was ſacked and raſed to the ground by the Greeks, at the concluſion of the Trojan war. That this had been the fate of the place was the general opinion; but the Ilienſians themſelves contradicted it; and maintained, that their city had at no time been deſtroyed, from its firſt foundation to that very day. In proof of the ſubverſion of the city, appeal was made to the ſtatue of Minerva at Ilium; which,

which, in Strabo's time, was erect upon its legs; and, therefore, it was ſaid, was not the antient ſtatue: for the ſtatue mentioned by Homer was in a ſitting poſture; as appears by the directions given by Helenus, that Hecuba, when ſhe went in ſolemn proceſſion with the Trojan matrons, to make her offerings of ſupplication to the Goddeſs, ſhould lay the *Peplus* upon the knees of the ſtatue.

Θεῖναι Αθηναίης ἐπὶ γένασιν.

The Ilienſians anſwered, that the ſenſe of theſe words of Homer was miſtaken. That the prepoſition ἐπὶ was here uſed in the ſenſe of παρὰ, producing a paſſage of the Odyſſey, where it certainly is ſo uſed.

——ἦ δ' ἧσαι ἐπ' ἐσχάρῃ ἐν πυρὸς αὐγῇ.

It was replied to them on the other ſide, if for the greater perſpicuity we may be allowed to ſtate the ſum of the argument as it would ſtand in plain Engliſh, that the words Θεῖναι ἐπὶ γένασιν as neceſſarily rendered "to place upon the knees," as in this line

Μή πῶϛε γένασιν οἷσιν ἐφίσσεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν

the words ἐφίσσεσθαι γένασιν render "to be ſet upon the knees;" and that a placing of the *peplus* παρὰ γένασιν was unintelligible. This

was unanſwerable. The Ilienſians and their party were driven, as to their laſt ſhift, to a manœuvre of criticiſm, of conſiderable ſubtlety. They inſiſted, that the *accent* was miſplaced. And changing the place of the accent upon the word γυναϲιν, they made it γυνάϲι from the oxyton γυνὰξ, inſtead of γόναϲιν from the paroxyton γόυ, or the obſolete γόνας. And then they pretended, that nothing was ſaid, in this paſſage, about "placing upon knees;" for, with this correction, as they would call it, of the accent, no mention indeed of "knees" remained. For the paroxyton γόυ ſignifies a "knee;" but the oxyton γυνὰξ is equivalent to ἱκεϭία, and ſignifies "ſupplication." Admitting, therefore, that the words ἐπὶ γόναϲιν would render "upon the knees," as they certainly would; ἐπι γυνάϲιν, by the variation of the accent, are other words, and render another ſenſe; namely, for "ſupplications" i. e. for the purpoſes of ſupplication.

This is the ſum of the argument on either ſide, founded upon this expreſſion of Homer's, in that controverſy concerning the ſubverſion of Ilium, which was agitated in Strabo's time, as that argument is re-

preſented by Strabo*. The inference is inevitable, that the Greek verſe of Homer was written with accents at that time. It appears, too, that the written marks of accent afforded a clear diſtinction, between the ſenſes of words not otherwiſe diſtinguiſhed. From whence it is reaſonable to conclude, that accents were not only written, but pronounced, in the time of Strabo. For the buſineſs would be done only by halves, if the difference of ſenſe was repreſented only to the eye of the reader, and not conveyed to the ear of the hearer, by a correſponding difference of ſound. The Greek language, therefore, and in particular Greek verſe, was both written and pronounced with accent, in the time of Strabo. Strabo died about 25 years before the commencement of the Chriſtian æra.

Of the uſe of accents at this time we have additional proof, from the expreſs mention that is made of them by another writer, Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis, who was nearly contemporary with Strabo. But, as the paſſage of Dionyſius, which affords the proof, is immediately connected with another, which has been alleged, by philologers of

* Lib. XIII.

great

great eminence, as a deciſive authority on the other ſide; we ſhall wave this evidence for the preſent, and take occaſion, in another place, to conſider the joint effect of the two, when we come to ſpeak of the objections to the uſe of accents. At preſent, we reſt in this concluſion, upon the authorities of Quinctilian and Strabo, that the marks of the accents were in uſe in writing, at leaſt 50 years before the commencement of the æra of our Lord; and we proceed to the ſecond queſtion, which we ſtated as in ſome meaſure diſtinct, whether theſe marks expreſs the true ſpeaking tones of the Greek language, according to the pronunciation which was in uſe, when it was a living language, and ſpoken in its purity. The diſcuſſion of this will indeed ſoon bring us back to a farther inveſtigation of the antiquity of the marks.

Now, upon this ſecond queſtion, it may be obſerved generally, that the marks of the accents certainly repreſent that pronunciation of the language, in the circumſtance of tone, which was in general uſe, at the time when they were invented. For to what purpoſe could any ſuch marks be intro-

duced, but to exhibit to the eye certain inflexions of the voice, certain parts of the ſound of the language, which were not expreſſed by the naked letters? And, in particular, it has been ſhewn, that in Strabo's time the accents were not only written but ſounded.

As for the notion of thoſe, who, admitting a conſiderable antiquity of the accents, contend, that they were originally invented for ſome other purpoſe, than to expreſs the ſpeaking tones; it hardly deſerves a ſerious confutation. What was that other purpoſe? Was it, as ſome have ſaid, to diſtinguiſh the metrical quantities of ſyllables? Quantity had its own marks; and the accents are never mentioned, by the writers upon quantity, as applied to that uſe. Was it, as others have fancied, to expreſs muſical notes? The accents were inſufficient for this purpoſe. They afforded indeed a general diſtinction of acute and grave; but they repreſented not the degrees of acuteneſs and gravity. Add to this, that muſic, in the earlieſt times, had its own marks; a ſyſtem of characters, formed from the letters of the alphabet, in which every particular note, in every one of the fifteen modes, and of the three

three genera, was expreſſed by its diſtinct and proper ſign. The invention of this antient ſcore is aſcribed, by Ariſtides Quintilianus, to Pythagoras*; probably becauſe Pythagoras firſt ſet the example of forming ſymbols of muſical notes, by modifications of the alphabetical characters. And afterwards, when the modes were multiplied, the additional ſymbols, which became neceſſary, were ſtill formed upon the ſame principle. Thus he was juſtly reputed the inventor of the whole ſyſtem. However that might be; theſe marks, which had no ſort of affinity with accents, were certainly tranſmitted from very early times. This is evident, from the manner in which the airs of the great moral compoſer, Damon, the friend and preceptor of Pericles, are mentioned by Ariſtides Quinctilianus†, as extant in his time, and generally well underſtood and admired. Accents, therefore, were not the marks either of quantity or of muſical tones; nor is there the leaſt reaſon to ſuppoſe, they were ever applied to any other purpoſe, than to expreſs the tones of common ſpeech.

* Ariſtid. Quinct. apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 28.
† Ibid. p. 95.

But it is ſaid, that theſe marks were the invention of a late and barbarous age, when the true pronunciation of the language was forgotten; and that the ſyſtem of accentuation was framed by men ignorant of the true rules of quantity. As to the lateneſs of the age of the invention, it appears with certainty to have been prior to the Chriſtian æra. Perhaps the Greek language had ſeen its beſt days, before the birth of Chriſt. But from that time to the very end of the fourth century, it ſubſiſted, not only as a living language, but in a good degree of purity in the writings of men of learning. We find it in great purity in what remains of the great work of Diodorus Siculus; in the works of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis; in the periegeſis of Dionyſius the Geographer; in St. Luke, in Epictetus, in Ælian, in Lucian the buffoon, in Juſtin Martyr, in Theophilus of Antioch, in Athenagoras, in Origen, in Herodian the hiſtorian, in Gregory Nazianzen, and in St. Chryſoſtom. And, although in different parts of this extenſive period, and even before it, writers may be found not diſtinguiſhed by any elegance of ſtyle and compoſition; ſuch certainly were the great Polybius, Plutarch, Pauſanias, Plotinus; yet it will

will be difficult to diſcover, in the worſt and lateſt of them, any traces of the incurſions of barbariſm. Certainly, therefore, the times immediately before the birth of Chriſt were no times of barbariſm; nor can it be ſuppoſed, that, in ſo early a period, the true pronunciation of the Greek language could be loſt. For the aſſertion, that the inventors of the ſyſtem of accentuation were unſkilled in the metrical quantities of the language; we need only to look into the ſyſtem itſelf for the confutation of it. There we find, that quantity is the very foundation, on which it ſtands; quantity is the only circumſtance, which the moſt general rules, for the ſpecies or the ſeat of the accent, regard. So far as either is not determined by quantity, it is matter of mere uſage. And both the ſpecies and ſeat of the accent are perpetually changed, in declinable words, according to the variations of quantity produced by the inflexions. From theſe circumſtances it is evident, that the inventors of the rules of accent, whoever they were, and in whatever times they lived, were critically ſkilled in quantity, and well underſtood the relation between tone and time.

It might probably, therefore, be concluded, that the marks of the accents exhibit the true ſpeaking tones of the Greek language, upon the ſuppoſition, that they were introduced in no earlier an age, than that, which the teſtimonies of Quinctilian and Strabo point out, as the lateſt poſſible date of the invention. But we have great authority to claim for it a much higher antiquity. Euſtathius, upon the word ἐάτεας (Il. B. 765.) mentions certain peculiarities of accentuation, belonging to the Attic dialect. Not that the Attic writers had a ſyſtem of their own, differing from the general ſyſtem in its fundamental rules. But their practice differed in ſome things, which were matters of mere cuſtom and uſage. Thus they circumflexed the penult, in ſome words of three ſyllables, where the common practice was to give an acute accent upon the antepenult. And ſome words, which, according to the common uſage, were oxytons, the Attics paroxytoniſed.

From Schol. Venet.

From this fact, recorded by Euſtathius, it ſeems a ſafe concluſion, that the marks of the accents were introduced in a very early age, while the Greek language was ſubſiſting in its different dialects; conſequently, while it

it was both ſpoken, and written, in its purity. For without marks, how ſhould the diſtinction, between the circumflex and the acute accent, be preſerved? and how ſhould the peculiarities of the Attic accentuation be at all remembered, when that dialect was no longer ſpoken, if the antient writers had not expreſſed the ſingularities of their own way of pronouncing by marks in their writing? But, if the marks of accent were of ſo early a date, there ſeems little room to doubt, that they expreſs the true ſpeaking tones of the language.

This concluſion from Euſtathius receives conſiderable confirmation, from a paſſage in the Cratylus; in which tone is mentioned, as a fundamental part of the Greek language: and the placing of the accent is made an eſſential branch of the proceſs, in the formation of compoſite words. It is true, that the words of Plato, in this paſſage, are not ſuch, as immediately and neceſſarily refer to any marks of accent, but to the ſound. But in the formation of the word Διόφιλος, from the two words, Διὶ φίλος, the removal of the acute tone, from the middle ſyllable of the compound word, is mentioned as no leſs neceſſary, than the expunction of

the

the ſecond ι in the word Δεῖ. It ſhould ſeem, therefore, that, in the writing of the word, a mark of the tone was juſt as neceſſary, as any of the alphabetical letters that compoſed it. For ſince the tone was an eſſential part of the word; the picture of the word to the eye muſt have been as imperfect, without a mark of the tone, as the omiſſion of a letter, or a falſe-ſpelling, would have made it. So, in forming the word ἄνθρωπος, from the two, ἀναθρεῖ ὀπωπώς, it is the laſt ſtep in the buſineſs to barytoniſe the latter part of the word. The whole proceſs ſeems to have been this.

ἀναθρεῖ ὀπωπώς

"*He contemplates having ſeen*"

an excellent definition of man, the only animal who reaſons upon the objects of his ſenſes.

Firſt, Expunging the ſecond α in ἀναθρεῖ, we get

ἀνθρεῖ ὀπωπώς.

Secondly, Take away the Attic reduplication in ὀπωπώς, and we get

ἀνθρεῖ ὠπώς.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, By a ſort of craſis of the diphthong ει with the ω, we get one word

ἀνθρωπως.

Fourthly, Changing the ω in the laſt ſyllable into ο

ἀνθρωπος.

Fifthly, But then, to finiſh the word, the accents of its two conſtituent parts muſt be diſpoſed of. The firſt, ἀνθρεῖ, has a circumflex upon its laſt ſyllable; and the ſecond, an acute upon the laſt ſyllable. Now, Plato ſays the *end* of the new word, that is, the two latter ſyllables*, muſt be grave: which is the ſame thing as to ſay, that the firſt ſyllable muſt be acute, ἄνθρωπος. Whence it appears by the way, that the word ἄνθρωπος, in which the penult is long, was pronounced in Plato's time, as it was afterwards, with an acute accent upon the antepenult†.

It muſt be confeſſed, that the formation of the word ἄνθρωπος is not given in this detail by Plato. It is only generally deſcribed; accentuation, however, being made a neceſſary part of the buſineſs. It would

* τελευτὴ—So τέλος is uſed by Athenæus, Lib. IV. c. 13, for the laſt two ſyllables of a word of three ſyllables.

† Vide Platonem Serrani, Tom. I. p. 399.

certainly

certainly be too much to conclude from this paſſage of the Cratylus, taken by itſelf, that the Greek language was written with the accents, in the time of Plato; or that the pronunciation, at that time, was eſſentially the ſame, which the marks expreſs. It is brought forward only as preſumptive evidence. But, allowing it to be no more, we have to allege, in confirmation of it, the more explicit and the repeated mention of accents, which occurs in the writings of Ariſtotle. In his Poetics, he ſpeaks of acuteneſs, gravity, and that which is between the two, (the tone of the circumflex), as affections of the firſt elements of ſpeech, (the ſounds of the Letters), diſtinct from length and brevity*. In his Rhetoric, he mentions the three accents, the acute, the grave, and the middle; and ſpeaks of attention to accent, as a circumſtance of great importance to a juſt elocution†. And again, in the books upon ſophiſtical diſputation, he mentions accent, as ſo eſſential a part of the Greek language, that plauſible ſophiſtical argument might often be raiſed upon a perverſion of the accent of a ſingle word, and

* Cap. XX. † Lib. III. cap. I.

could

could only be confuted by the correction of it *.

It muſt be confeſſed, however, that he makes a remark upon the nature of this ſpecies of ſophiſm, which turns upon the accent, from which it may ſeem to ſome a fair concluſion, that, of whatever importance tone might be in the ſound of the Greek language, the marks of accent were not in uſe, in writing, in the time of Ariſtotle. This at leaſt may ſeem the fair concluſion, if Ariſtotle's meaning be rightly explained by his commentator, Alexander Aphrodiſienſis. Ariſtotle ſays, that this ſort of ſophiſm was not ſo eaſily formed in oral debate, as upon written words. The ground of the diſtinction Alexander Aphrodiſienſis thus explains: "In oral debate the ſpeaker is tied to the accent, that he has once given; and cannot change the meaning of his terms upon his antagoniſt, by removing the acute tone, from one ſyllable to another of any word.—But in writing, a word, that has no accent marked upon it, opens the door to this ſpecies of paralogiſm." The greater facility therefore of this ſophiſm, in the opinion of this commentator, lay in this

* De Sophiſt. Elench. Lib. I. c. 3. & Lib. XI. c. 3.

circumſtance;

circumſtance; that the tones, neceſſarily given by the ſpeaker's voice, were not always expreſſed by marks in writing. But, allowing this to be the true ground of Ariſtotle's diſtinction, it is by no means a juſt inference, that the marks of accent were not known, or not for the moſt part uſed in writing, in his time. The moſt that could be inferred would be, that thoſe marks were not univerſally uſed in that time; that the language was ſometimes written without them. And the only neceſſary inference would be ſtill much leſs than this; namely, that a captious diſputant might, in writing, omit the accent of a particular word, on purpoſe to leave himſelf an opening for quibbling upon his own expreſſions. But, in fact, Ariſtotle's diſtinction requires not the aſſumption, which his commentator makes, of a want of accents in writing, even upon the word, upon which the paralogiſm is raiſed. The diſtinction will hold good, without any ſuch ſuppoſition. For the caſe will ſtill be, that, in oral debate, the diſputant muſt abide by the accent, which he has once given. Whereas in arguing upon written words, he will always have it in his power to pretend, that the accent is miſplaced, by an error of the

the pen. And thus the ſenſe of a written ſentence may be rendered doubtful and ambiguous, by queſtioning the propriety of the accentuation; of which we have ſeen a curious inſtance, in the controverſy about the deſtruction of Troy.

Alexander Aphrodiſienſis illuſtrates this ſpecies of ſophiſm, by a well-choſen example of a law, in which the ſenſe depends entirely upon the accuracy of accentuation. Ἑταίρα χρυσία εἰ φοροίη δημόσια ἴτω. The word δημόσια, with the acute accent upon the antepenult, is the neuter nominative plural, in appoſition with χρυσία. And the ſenſe is, "If a courtezan wear golden trinkets, let them [viz. her golden trinkets,] be forfeited to the public uſe." But if the accent be advanced to the penult, the word, without any other change, becomes the feminine nominative ſingular, and muſt be taken in appoſition with ἑταίρα. And thus the ſenſe will be, "If a courtezan wear golden trinkets, let *her* become public property." This is a very notable inſtance of the political importance of accents, of written accents, in the Greek language. For if this law had been put in writing without any accent upon the word δημόσια, there would have been no means of

deciding between two conſtructions; either of which the words, in this ſtate, would equally have admitted: and it muſt have remained an inexplicable doubt, whether the legiſlator meant, that the poor woman ſhould only forfeit her trinkets, or become a public ſlave. If ſuch ambiguity and confuſion could ariſe, from the omiſſion of the accent upon a ſingle word; what muſt have been the caſe, if the accents, in writings of importance, had been entirely omitted? This is an internal evidence of the antiquity of accents, drawn from the very nature of the thing; and furniſhes a ſort of proof, *a priori*, that the Greek language at no time could have been without them. But however this may be, it is difficult not to draw the concluſion, from the paſſages that have been produced from the writings of Plato and Ariſtotle, (putting together what is ſaid by both of them), that accentuation, as it ſtood in their time, was reduced to a very regular ſyſtem, and to the ſtricteſt rules. And it is no leſs difficult to conceive, that this could be done, without written characters of tone, than that grammar could be carried to any good degree of perfection, without an alphabet.

Not,

Not, however, to lay more ſtreſs, than it will fairly bear, upon a ſort of evidence, which may not ſtrike the minds of all with equal force; we will recur to what ſeems to have been proved, by direct teſtimony, beyond any reaſonable doubt, (except any ſhall ariſe from contrary teſtimonies equally direct), that, at ſome period before the extinction of the different dialects, the marks of accent were in uſe.

It might throw conſiderable light upon the queſtion of the age of the invention, if indeed the invention was not nearly coæval with the firſt writing of the language, could we aſcertain the exact epoch of that great change, when the different dialects gave way to the general prevalence, of what was called, the *lingua communis*. This is not eaſy to be ſettled with preciſion. It is the more difficult, by reaſon of an abſurd practice of tranſcribers, which ſeems to have been taken up early, of tranſlating the dialectic writers into the *lingua communis*. Agatharchides of Cnidos is mentioned by Photius, as an Attic writer. But in the extracts from his works, which Photius gives, little of the Attic dialect appears. It was not only, in

the making of extracts, that this liberty was taken. Entire works have undergone the ſame tranſmutation. Archimedes wrote in the Doric dialect, in which many of his works are ſtill extant; namely, the books upon Sphæroids, upon Spirals, upon the Centre of Gravity of Planes, the Pſammites, and the Quadrature of the Parabola. But his two moſt celebrated works, which were probably the moſt generally read, his two books upon the Sphere and Cylinder, and his Quadrature of the Circle, are in the *lingua communis*. His Commentator Eutocius, who lived about the end of the fifth century, and ſeems to have been a man of good taſte, as well as a conſiderable mathematician, complains, that, in his time, no MS. of theſe works was to be found, in which the genuine Doriſms of Archimedes were preſerved. The language of Herodotus himſelf was not left untouched. It was diveſted of many of its Ioniſms, until they were reſtored by Gronovius, from his Medicean MS. the only one perhaps in which they remain, in their native purity. The effect of this barbarous practice may have been to anticipate, in appearance, the true æra of the exſtinction of the dialects. Since we cannot be ſure, that

Bentl. on Phalaris

that ſome authors, whom we now read in the *lingua communis*, might not have written in the proper dialects of their reſpective countries. In Æneas's tactics, there ſeem to be few, if any, dialectic idioms. And yet Caſaubon, from many circumſtances of conſiderable weight, concludes, that the author, if not the very ſame perſon, could have been but a few years later than Æneas the Arcadian, who was contemporary with Xenophon.

However, it may, with great probability, be ſuppoſed, that the *lingua communis* firſt came into general uſe, when the different ſtates of Greece became, as it were, one people, by falling under the dominion of the Romans. The battle of Cynoſcephalæ, at which Philip was defeated by Flaminius, and ſoon after which Greece was enſlaved by the Romans, under the pretence of being reſtored to liberty: this battle was fought, in the year before the vulgar æra of our Lord 197: and the city of Corinth was ſacked by Mummius, in the year before our Lord 146. The middle time between theſe two events may, with great probability, be aſſumed, as the epoch of the general introduction of the *lingua communis*. And accordingly,

cordingly, about that time Polybius flouriſhed; one of the firſt writers, among thoſe at leaſt that remain, that uſed that common language. Æneas cannot be reckoned in the number; for, either he was not of that great antiquity, which Caſaubon, not without weighty reaſon indeed, aſcribes to him; or his work has been tranſlated. The introduction of the *lingua communis* was undoubtedly in itſelf a great alteration; and it led the way to others. The utter extinction of the dialects was not, however, the immediate effect. For the Doric, in ſome places pure, in others with a mixture more or leſs of the Æolic, was ſpoken, in the Peloponneſus, in the time of Strabo*.

From this time, however, the dialects were probably little uſed in writing, though in the country itſelf, they continued for ſome time in vernacular uſe. The epoch, therefore, of the introduction of the *lingua communis*, and that of the diſuſe of the dialects, may be conſidered as the ſame.

But if we place this great change a hundred years earlier, or a hundred years later, than the time we have aſſumed for it; our concluſion, concerning the truth of the ex-

* Lib. VIII.

preſſion

preſſion of the marks of accent, either way will ſtand unſhaken. If this change took place a hundred years ſooner, than we have ſuppoſed; then, the marks of the accents, which we have proved from Euſtathius to have been prior to it, muſt have been nearly, if not quite as old, as the time of Ariſtotle. If it took place a hundred years later, the Greek language ſubſiſted in its different dialects, and by conſequence was ſpoken in its purity, to the very time, which, from the direct evidence adduced from Quinctilian and Strabo, is the very lateſt date, that can be affixed to the invention of the marks of the accents. And, either way, the notion, that theſe marks do not expreſs the true ſpeaking tones of the language, will be abſurd. The marks were either of a very early age, which there is the greateſt reaſon to believe; or, if they were of a late one, ſtill the original pronunciation of the language was tranſmitted down below the lateſt poſſible time of the invention. This would be the caſe, if the true pronunciation laſted only to the commencement of the vulgar æra. But it is evident from Euſtathius, that it was not loſt in the times of Adrian and Antoninus. What he ſays, in the place already cited, of

the common rules of accentuation, and of the deviations of the Attics from thoſe rules, he gives upon the authority of three grammarians of great name among the antients; Ælius Dionyſius, Herodian, and Ptolemy of Aſcalon. The age of the laſt is uncertain; but Ælius Dionyſius flouriſhed in the reign of Adrian; and Herodian, in the reign of Antoninus. They had all written largely upon the Proſodies, and upon the peculiarities of the Attic Proſodies. And it cannot be conceived, that theſe learned men ſhould have pretended to ſpecify the minute differences of pronunciation, in the different dialects, if the true pronunciation, in their time, was gone into oblivion. It ſeems indeed not improbable, that, upon the introduction of the *lingua communis*, deviations from the old way of ſpeaking in ſome few words, and in ſome few only; in words in which the accentuation was, in ſome meaſure, arbitrary, not ſtrictly defined by the fundamental rules, inſenſibly crept in. But notwithſtanding theſe i conſ d rable corruptions, it may reaſonably be ſuppoſed, that the pronunciation of the Greek language even in the time of Euſtathius, who flouriſhed in the beginning of the thirteenth century, much more nearly reſembled

ſembled the pronunciation of the beſt ages, than any thing we can ſubſtitute for it now; certainly much more than our barbarous recitation of Greek with the Latin accent, and with the Latin corrupted by our bad way of ſounding it. Inſtead of diſcarding the accents, we ſhould endeavour to acquire the true enunciation. But to return to the argument.

The proof that we have adduced, that the marks of accent were the invention of an earlier age, than is generally imagined; and that, whatever the age of the invention might be, the ſpeaking tones are truly repreſented to the eye by theſe marks, ſeems in itſelf complete and ſatisfactory. But it may be proper to conſider the objections brought on the other ſide.

Theſe objections ſtand upon three different grounds. The firſt is a vague unwarranted aſſertion, which has already been abundantly refuted; that the marks of accents were brought into uſe in a very late age, and were the invention of men unacquainted with the true pronunciation, and ignorant of the rules of quantity. The ſecond is the ground of authorities; conſiſting in pretended teſtimonies of reſpectable grammarians. And

the third, is the ſuppoſed inconſiſtency of accent, according to the Greek ſyſtem, with the melody of verſe, and the rhythm of proſe.

As for the authorities, that have been brought againſt the antiquity and the uſe of accents, they will be found, upon examination, to amount to nothing. Indeed they are but two; a pretended teſtimony of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis, and an inference from Euſtathius.

Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis, in the eleventh ſection of his elegant treatiſe upon the arrangement of words, towards the end, has this paſſage*.

"Elocution" he ſays, "in proſe (he is "ſpeaking of what elocution in proſe ſhould "be), never violates the times either of a "noun or a verb, nor changes them. But "ſuch as it receives the ſyllables from na-"ture, both the ſhort and the long, ſuch it "preſerves them. Rhythm and muſic, on "the contrary, change them, ſhortening

* Ἡ μὲν γὰρ πεζὴ λέξις οὐδενὸς ὥστε ὀνόματος ὥστε ῥήματος βιάζεται τοὺς χρόνους, οὐ δὲ μετατίθησιν· ἀλλ' οἵας παρείληφε τῇ φύσει τὰς συλλαβὰς, τάς τε μακρὰς καὶ τὰς βραχείας, τοιαύτας φυλάττει. Ἡ δὲ ῥυθμικὴ καὶ μουσικὴ μεταβάλλουσιν αὐτὰς, μειοῦσαι καὶ αὔξουσαι, ὥστε πολλάκις εἰς τἀναντία μεταχωρεῖν. Οὐ γὰρ ταῖς συλλαβαῖς ἀπευθύνουσι τοὺς χρόνους, ἀλλὰ τοῖς χρόνοις τὰς συλλαβας. p. 78. 80. Uptoni.

 "and

" and lengthening, at pleaſure; ſo that often " they become the reverſe [of what they are " naturally]. For muſical compoſition ad- " juſts not the times to the ſyllables, but the " ſyllables to the times." Upon this paſſage Upton, the learned editor, has this extraordinary note. " *Inſigne teſtimonium. Nihil ſane apertius dici poteſt contra receptam apud nos accentuum rationem, eorumque uſum. Eſt autem ſuus ex his etiam (ſeu iis potius quos veteres adhibuerunt) accentibus ſermoni cantus, ſed paucis opinor notus.*" If the learned Upton be right in this remark, the controverſy is at an end, and accents are victorious. For if nothing more explicit can be ſaid againſt them, than is ſaid by Dionyſius in this paſſage, nothing at all can be ſaid; for certainly nothing is ſaid here. The paſſage has no relation at all to accent; the ſubject of which it treats, being not tone, but time. Dionyſius is ſpeaking of the indefinite liberty, taken by muſical compoſers, and occaſionally, in the exerciſe of the *licentia poetica*, by verſifiers, with the natural quantity of ſyllables. In the preceding paragraph, indeed, he ſpeaks of an equal liberty, that was taken, in muſical compoſition, with the accents of ſyllables. And in this paſſage

we

we ſhall find a very explicit teſtimony indeed, in favour of the received method of accents, and their uſe. Theſe are the two paſſages, which were mentioned above; the one as deciſive on the ſide of accents; the other, as alleged as an authority on the other ſide. And this is the proper place to conſider them, as we propoſed, in connection. But for this purpoſe, it will be neceſſary to conſider them, both in reference to the particular ſubject, to which they belong; and to ſtate the general ſcope of the argument, of which each makes a part.

In the tenth ſection of this celebrated tract, περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων, the author, having in the nine preceding ſections, gone through ſome preliminary matter, and ſlightly touched ſome collateral points, comes to enquire, what ſhould be the principal aim of any writer, who would arrange his words in the beſt manner, either in verſe or proſe; and he affirms, that ſweetneſs and beauty (ἡ ἡδονὴ καὶ τὸ κάλον) ſhould be his primary objects. In what theſe two things differ, may be underſtood at once, and more readily than by any definition, by the examples, that the author gives of different ſtyles poſſeſſing the one or the other of theſe qualities ſeparately,

ly, or both together. He mentions the diction of Thucydides, as poſſeſſing beauty without ſweetneſs; that of Xenophon, as poſſeſſing ſweetneſs without beauty; and the diction of Herodotus, as poſſeſſing both. Having thus ſettled what are the firſt objects of compoſition, and explained the diſtinction between the two; he proceeds in the eleventh ſection, (in which the two paſſages to be explained occur), to the queſtion, which is indeed the immediate ſubject of the whole treatiſe; what thoſe things are, which produce ſweetneſs and beauty of diction, either in metre, in ſong, or in proſe. And theſe, he ſays, are four; Μέλος, a certain modulation of tone; Ρύθμος, a certain modulation of quantity; Μεταβολὴ, change; and Πρέπον, fitneſs; which laſt is an adjunct of the former three. By change, is meant a change either of the tonic modulation, or of the rhythm. Of the tonic modulation, when the notes are transferred from a lower to a higher octave, or the contrary. Of the rhythm, when one denomination, or arrangement of feet, is changed for another; as iambs for trochs, dactyls for cretics, the heroic for the proſodic or Ionic verſe. By fitneſs, is to be underſtood the ſuitableneſs, both of the tonic modulation and of the rhythm,

rhythm, to the ſubject; and the propriety of the change, in either of theſe, according to the changes in the ſentiment or paſſion to be expreſſed.

That all the charms of elocution ariſe from theſe four things, daily experience, he ſays, proves. In the fulleſt theatres a general diſpleaſure and diſguſt of the audience might be obſerved, if the moſt ſkilful muſician chanced to ſtrike a ſingle note out of tune; or a favourite actor failed in the true quantity of a ſingle ſyllable; or the moſt admired dancer made a ſingle motion out of time. He concludes, therefore, that all mankind have a natural feeling of tone and time. Nor, ſays he, are they inſenſible to the graces of tranſition and fitneſs. For, whether in inſtrumental or vocal performance, or in dancing, let the compoſition be ever ſo ſweet, and the execution ever ſo graceful, if ſeaſonable tranſitions are not made, or there be any deviation from fitneſs, the diſguſt is extreme, and whatever is not in harmony with the ſubject is diſpleaſing.

Theſe examples, he ſays, taken from theatrical performances, are not foreign to his argument. For there is, he adds, a certain muſic even of political oratory; which

which differs from muſic properly ſo called, whether inſtrumental or vocal, in quantity only, not in quality, i. e. in degree, not in kind. For in this too, [in this muſic of oratory], the words receive tone, rhythm, change, and fitneſs.

Then he proceeds, to explain more particularly the difference between this muſic of the orator, and muſic ſtrictly ſo called; i. e. the difference between ſpeaking and ſinging. He mentions three remarkable circumſtances, in which it principally conſiſts. The firſt is, that the tonic modulation of ſpeech is meaſured, upon the muſical ſcale, as nearly as poſſible by the ſingle interval of the diapente. For the ſpeaking note is never ſtretched to the acute, beyond three tones and a hemitone; nor is ſunk to the grave, more than this ſpace*.

In this paſſage the Halicarnaſſian is not ſpeaking, as ſome have moſt abſurdly ſuppoſed, of any phyſical limitations of the powers of the human voice; as if the natural key of the voice of all human beings, ſavages, and civilized nations, men, women,

* Διαλέκτου μὲν οὖν μέλος ἐνὶ μετρεῖται διαστήματι, τῷ λεγομένῳ διὰ πέντε, ὃς ἔγγιστα, καὶ οὔτε ἐπιτείνεται πέρα τῶν τριῶν τόνων καὶ ἡμιτονίου ἐπὶ τὸ ὀξὺ, οὔτε ἀνίεται τοῦ χωρίου τούτου πλεῖον ἐπὶ τὸ βαρύ. p. 76.

boys,

boys, and girls, lay between the ſame points upon the muſical ſcale;—a notion too palpably falſe, to deſerve contradiction, had it not been adopted by ſome, who have affected to be learned upon this ſubject. But it is not leſs repugnant to common ſenſe, than it is inconſiſtent with the explicit doctrine of the antient writers upon harmony. It is indeed their general principle, that the ſinging powers, of any one voice, extend not beyond the double diapaſon. But ſo little did they conceive, that all voices lay within the ſame points of the ſcale, that Ariſtoxenus ſays*, that, by mixing the voices of both ſexes, and of different ages, and by tuning inſtruments to the various pitches of theſe different voices, they could aſcend beyond three, or even four times, the diapaſon. For ſo great he reckoned the interval between the loweſt man's, and the higheſt woman's, or boy's voice. But this relates to the powers of the voice in ſong. The meaning of Dionyſius is, that any ſpeaker, who ſpeaks gracefully, never riſes more than three tones and a hemitone above the ordinary level of his *own* voice, nor ſinks lower beneath it. Different ſpeakers will ſpeak in

* Ariſtoxenes apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 20.

very

very different keys. And it will not be generally true of two different ſpeakers, that the higheſt and the loweſt tones of the one will never be more than three tones and a half, above or below the ordinary key of the other. But it will be true of either, if he be a good ſpeaker, that the range of his voice, compared with itſelf at any one time, will be confined within theſe limits. This aſſertion, however, is to be underſtood of plain ſpeech only. It is not true of ſinging; nor is it true of imitative ſpeaking, on the ſtage. An actor, who has to expreſs any ſudden emotion, or earneſt ſupplication, or acute diſtreſs, or intenſe pain, muſt often go greatly beyond the limits, within which the Halicarnaſſian circumſcribes the tones of the orator.

To this obſervation upon the range of the voice in common ſpeaking, Dionyſius adds ſome general remarks upon accent; not entering into the detail of the rules of accentuation, but briefly mentioning ſome of the moſt general principles, which might be of uſe in a farther elucidation of the difference between the ſpeaking and the muſical tones; ſuch as theſe; that every word muſt have one acute accent; that, in ſome caſes, the acute and the grave accents are blended upon

upon the ſame ſyllable, and by their union, form the circumflex; that when any one ſyllable of a word has an acute accent, all the other ſyllables of the ſame word muſt be grave.

He then obſerves, that muſic, inſtrumental or vocal, is not confined in its tones within the narrow limits of the ſpeaker's voice; but runs freely, and at large, to every part of the ſcale, and through the whole. "It makes uſe, he ſays, of all the intervals: "beginning with the diapaſon, it goes through "the diapente, the diateſſaron, the ditone*, "and the hemitone; and, as ſome think, can "ſenſibly expreſs even the Diëſis." This is one principal circumſtance, in which the plain ſpeech of oratory differs from ſong; that the lyric muſe has the free range of the whole ſcale, while the voice of the orator

* διάτονον muſt certainly be a falſe reading, in the text of Dionyſius, for δίτονον. The word διάτονον was not the name of any note, or of any interval, in the antient ſcale. The adjective διάτονος was added, as an epithet, to the names of ſome of the moveable ſounds, to diſtinguiſh thoſe of the Diatonic *genus*, from ſounds of the ſame name in the other *genera*. For inſtance, the λιχανὸς μέσων is one of the moveable ſounds. We have therefore λιχανὸς μέσων ἐναρμόνιος,—λιχανὸς μέσων χρωματικὴ,—and λιχανὸς μέσων διάτονος. But δίτονον, or the double tone, was one of the enharmonic intervals; and of intervals only Dionyſius is ſpeaking here.

is confined, in the variation of its tones, within narrow limits, and to a ſingle interval.

The next circumſtance of difference, mentioned by Dionyſius, is, that, in muſical compoſition, the words are made to conform to the notes, not the notes adapted to the words. That is to ſay, the muſical compoſer pays little or no attention to the ſpeaking tones. He applies a high note to a ſyllable, which, in common ſpeech is low, and a low note to a high ſyllable; and, contrary to the general rules of accent, often makes two adjoining ſyllables, in one and the ſame word, acute. This, he ſays, might be proved by many inſtances; but particularly by the airs of Euripides. Accordingly, he produces, as an inſtance, an air from the Oreſtes of Euripides; in which he ſhews, in what manner the muſical notes, as the words were ſet, differed from the accents, or ſpeaking tones, upon almoſt every ſyllable. This is the paſſage which has been mentioned, as affording the cleareſt evidence, that the marks of the accents were in uſe in the times of Dionyſius; that they then occupied the places aſſigned to them by the rules laid down by later grammarians; and, of conſequence, that theſe marks, ſo placed, are

a true repreſentation of the ſpeaking tones of the Greek language.

Σῖγα, σῖγα, λευκὸν ἴχνος ἀρβύλης
Τιθεῖτε, μη κτυπεῖτε.
Αποπρόβατ' ἐκεῖσ', ἀπόπροθι κοίτας.

Theſe are the words of the ſong. Dionyſius's remarks upon the muſic are theſe.

"The words Σιγα, σιγα, λευκον, were ſung "with a monotony, "although each of the "three words has grave accents and acute." "Again the word ἀρβυλης [in the muſic] has "the third ſyllable homotonous with the "middle. Although it is impoſſible [in ſpeak-"ing] that one word ſhould take two acute "accents. Of the word τιθειτε the firſt ſylla-"ble is made graver [than it naturally is]; "and the two following have an acute accent, "and the ſame ſound. The circumflexion in "the word κτυπεῖτε [in the muſical compoſi-"tion] is ſuppreſſed; for, the two ſyllables "are uttered with one and the ſame tone. "And the word Απροποβατε takes not the "acute accent, which properly belongs to "the middle ſyllable; but the tone of the "third deſcends upon the fourth ſyllable."

Αποπρόβατε

Now here it is to be obſerved, that Dionyſius ſpeaks of the three accents, the grave, the

the acute, and the circumflex. Any writer, who mentions the circumflex, muſt have been acquainted with the marks. For, the name of circumflex, περισπωμένη, or περισπασμὸς, has no reference to any thing in the ſound, but to the figure of the mark. It is a circumſtance, in which the muſic, according to Dionyſius, differed from common ſpeech, that the three words σιγα, σιγα, λευκον, were ſounded in monotony. Since this was a circumſtance of difference, they were not ſounded in monotony in common ſpeech. Therefore, the three were not all oxytons; but one, or more of them, was either circumflexed, antecircumflexed, or a paroxyton. And this, as far as it goes, is conſiſtent with the preſent ſtate of the accents upon theſe words. The muſic gave the ſame tone to the laſt ſyllable, as to the penult of the word ἀρβυλης; which was a remarkable difference from common ſpeech; for this reaſon, that common ſpeech admits not two *acute* accents upon one word. It is evidently implied, in this remark, that the word ἀρβυλης, in common ſpeech, had, in the time of Dionyſius, as it now has, an acute accent upon the penult. The word κυπειρος had a circumflex, in ſome part of it, in com-

mon ſpeech. For, it was a peculiarity of the muſical compoſition, that it ſuppreſſed the circumflexion. But it is contrary to the very nature of the circumflex, to fall upon any but a long ſyllable; and, in the word χλυπεῖς, the only long ſyllable is the penult. Upon the penult, therefore, the word χλυπεῖς was circumflexed, as it now is, in the time of Dionyſius. Again it appears, that ἀποπροβαῖς had an acute accent, in the time of Dionyſius, as now, upon the antepenult. It is very evident, that, in every one of theſe inſtances, Dionyſius ſpeaks of the accent, as a ſound actually given by the ſpeaker's voice. For, beſides that when he ſpeaks of the ſweetneſs and the beauty of ſpeech, of which he makes accent an eſſential part, he always means the ſweetneſs and the beauty of the ſound of ſpeech; what could be the alteration of ſound, that muſic produced, by the liberties taken with the accents, if the accents were not ſounded in common ſpeech? In that caſe, there was nothing in ſpeech to be the ſubject of alteration. Nothing, therefore, can be more certain, than the concluſion from this paſſage, that the marks of accent were in uſe in the time of Dionyſius. Nothing more certain, than that thoſe

marks

marks repreſented tones of the voice, or ſounds of common ſpeech. Nothing more probable than the concluſion, from the inſtances given from Dionyſius, that the ſyſtem of accentuation was the ſame, in his time, which is laid down in later writers. Nothing more probable, than that the accents, placed according to the rules of that ſyſtem, expreſs the true ſpeaking tones of the Greek language. Dionyſius proceeds to remark, in the ſubſequent paragraph (which has already been produced) a third circumſtance of difference, between muſic and common ſpeech; namely, that muſic takes the ſame liberty with quantity, as with tone. But this paſſage, which has no relation at all to the ſubject of accents, cannot invalidate the concluſion we have drawn from the preceding paragraph.

The teſtimony of the Halicarnaſſian turns out to be the very reverſe, of what was ſuppoſed. The other authority, brought againſt the accents, is nothing more than an inference from the paſſage of Euſtathius before cited. A concluſion has been drawn from that paſſage, that the antient Attic writers had a ſyſtem of accentuation, eſſentially different from that of the later gram-

marians. But this is much more, than any thing ſaid by Euſtathius will warrant. Euſtathius mentions ſome particular inſtances, in which the practice of the antient Attic writers, in things not neceſſarily determined by the principles of any ſyſtem, differed from the common practice. He ſays nothing of any ſyſtem of accentuation, among thoſe writers, differing from the common ſyſtem; and the inſtances he gives of their deviation, from the common practice, lead to no ſuch concluſion; but rather go to prove, that their principles were the ſame with thoſe, on which the common ſyſtem ſtands.

The fact is, that the firſt principles of accentuation, on which the whole ſyſtem of the Greek writers was founded, regarded quantity, and nothing elſe. But theſe fundamental rules left much undecided. There was nothing in the nature of quantity to determine, in any caſe, that the laſt ſyllable, in a word of more ſyllables than one, ſhould take the acute accent, or that it ſhould not. When the laſt ſyllable of a word of many ſyllables was ſhort, there was nothing in the fundamental rules, or in the nature of things, to determine, on which ſyllable, of

the

the laſt three, the acute accent ſhould be laid. Grammarians, naturally deſirous of finding ſome rule to direct them, in the writing of the language, in caſes which the general principles of accentuation left thus undecided; betook themſelves to a diligent and critical obſervation of the practice of the beſt writers; endeavouring to connect the place of the accent, not otherwiſe determined, with the figure and the ſpecies of words, and the manner of their formation. For, it was natural to ſuppoſe that, in words of the ſame figure, of the ſame ſpecies, and formed from their primitives, or ſimples, by a like proceſs of derivation or compoſition, there would be ſome uniformity of accentuation. Hence aroſe a great number of ſecondary rules; which had little connection with firſt principles, having no reference to quantity, but to the figures and ſpecies of words, and to the manner of their formations. Theſe rules, like all formed from mere induction, were ſimply declarative of the fact, without referring to any cauſe or principle, that, in ſuch a caſe, ſo the practice ſtands. And, as rules of mere uſage and cuſtom muſt ever be, they were liable to many exceptions. The Attic dialect, in

particular, according to Euſtathius, abounded in ſuch exceptions; but this was no contradiction to the general rules, of which theſe ſecondary rules made no eſſential part.

Thus it was one of theſe ſecondary rules, as we learn from this paſſage of Euſtathius, that compoſite adjectives, ending in -ης, coming from neuter ſubſtantives, of two ſyllables, in -ος, ſhould have the acute accent upon the final ſyllable. And, for this reaſon, Homer was cenſured by ſome critics, of no late age, for his manner of accenting the word οἰσέας. For, according to this rule, it ſhould be οἰσέας, not, as we have it in Homer, οἴστεας. But Euſtathius defends Homer's accentuation of the word, by what he had learned, from Ælius Dionyſius, of the practice of the Attic writers; namely, that they made the compoſites of ἔτος an exception to this general rule; for they ſaid διέτης, τριέτης, πενταέτης (not διέτης, τριέτης, &c.) pronouncing theſe words with the ſame tone as εὐεργέτης. And, following the analogy of thoſe words, Homer ſaid ὀϊέτης. Euſtathius ſays, that there were other inſtances, in which the Attics differed from the common uſage. For they ſaid τροπαῖον, not τρόπαιον; ἑτοῖμος,

ἑτοῖμος, not ἕτοιμος; ὁμοῖος, not ὅμοιος; ἐρῆμος, not ἔρημος. Again, though it was a general rule, that derivatives of three terminations, ending in -ρος, -ρα, -ρον, muſt be oxytons; the Attics made ſome ſuch proparoxytons; for they ſaid βδέλυρος, πόνηρος, μόχθηρος. It is to be obſerved, that in all theſe inſtances, the Attics, though they deviated from the ſecondary rule, the rule of uſage, adhered to the fundamental rules. For, when they barytonized the compounds of -ϐλος ending in -ης, ſuch as διέτης, &c. they placed the acute accent upon the penult, the laſt ſyllable being long. Again, when in the proparoxytons ἕτοιμος, ὅμοιος, &c. they advanced the acute accent from the antepenult to the penult; they changed it into a circumflex, in conformity to the fundamental rules; the penult being long, and the laſt ſyllable ſhort. When they made proparoxytons of the words βδέλυρος, &c. no fundamental rule was violated; for the laſt ſyllable of theſe words being ſhort, the fundamental rules allowed of the placing of the acute accent upon the antepenult.

In one claſs of words, indeed, which is not mentioned by Euſtathius, the Attics may ſeem to have deviated from the fundamental rules; namely, in polyſyllables in -εως, and

Soph. Aj. 953 — πῆμ', Ὀδυσσέως χάριν. Sic in Bru
1341. πλὴν Ἀχιλλέως.

and -εων, of their own proper declenſion, and ſome others. Their termination in -εως was made from the common terminations in -αος, -αιος, and -ειος;—as from Μενέλαος, Μενέλεως; from ἀνάγαιος, ἀνώγεως; from ἔυγειος, ἔυγεως; and in the neuter ἄνωγεων and ἔυγεων, for ἀνάγαιον and ἔυγειον. In theſe words, they retain the acute accent upon what ſeems the antepenult, notwithſtanding the laſt ſyllable is long. But the truth is, that theſe terminations, -εως and -εων, by a ſynecphoneſis of the vowels ε and ω, became, in ſound, one ſyllable. Thus the ſyllable, which, with the common termination, was the antepenult, became the penult of the Attic word; and it was perfectly conſiſtent with the general rules, that it ſhould bear an acute accent. Thus it appears, that the peculiarities of the Attic writers conſiſted not in deviations from the fundamental principles, but from thoſe ſecondary rules of mere uſage, with which other writers occaſionally, though leſs frequently, made free.

Is this always the Caſe?

It is of ſome importance to obſerve, that thoſe grammarians, who cenſured Homer's accentuation of the word οἰέτεας, who muſt themſelves have been older, or, at leaſt, not younger, than Ælius Dionyſius, and Herodian,

By Homer, the text ~~[illegible]~~ of Homer, as it stood in the time of these Critics could only be intended.—

Herodian, who defended him, muſt have conceived, that this peculiarity of accent came from Homer himſelf. Had they conſidered it only as the error of a tranſcriber; they would not have criticiſed the author, but they would have amended the writing. Theſe grammarians, themſelves earlier than the times of Adrian, muſt have conceived, that their language was written with accents, in the very earlieſt ages of writing; and that the rules of accentuation, for the violation of which they cenſured Homer, were known in his time.

So much for the argument, againſt the received accentuation of the Greek language, from authorities; which turns out to be ſomewhat leſs than nothing; the authorities being all brought over to the other ſide. No objection, therefore, now remains, but the ſuppoſed inconſiſtency of accent with quantity; which latter is ſuppoſed to be of the greater importance of the two, in the recitation either of verſe or proſe. This objection ſtands merely upon the vice of our pronunciation. The accents, as we give them, both in the Greek and in the Latin language, generally marr, and ſometimes utterly deſtroy,

ſtroy, the melody of verſe, and the rhythm of proſe. But this certainly was not the effect of the accents, in the mouths of the antients. With them εὐμέλεια and εὐρυθμία, the one depending upon tone, the other upon time, were equally eſſential to the ſweetneſs and beauty of the ſound of ſpeech, whether metrical or proſaic. They had ſome way, therefore, of giving accent, ſo as to be not deſtructive of quantity, but ſubſervient to it. And, if this way of ſpeaking could be recovered, we ſhould probably come very near to the true pronunciation of the Greek and Latin languages. The caſe is by no means deſperate. Two things only ſeem to be requiſite: firſt, to give every one of the vowels, and of the diphthongs, its true power, in its proper place: and, ſecondly, to pay a critical attention to the effect of the fundamental rules of accent, upon the *tones of words in connection*; a point which, perhaps, has never yet been ſufficiently conſidered. Before we enter upon the explanation of it, we muſt deſcribe, at ſome length, the powers of the ſeveral vowels, and diphthongs, and point out the uſual errors of our pronunciation.

1. *a.* This vowel, in the Latin language, has two diſtinct powers, according as it is long

long or ſhort. In the Greek, it has three; two long, and one ſhort. Its ſhort power, in both languages, is that of the Engliſh *a* in the words *hat*, *bat*, *carry*, *cabbage*. Of its two long powers, in the Greek language, one was full, broad, and open, like that of *a* in the Engliſh words, *all*, *ball*, *call*, &c. The other is that of the French *a*, according to the polite pronunciation, which is that of *a* in the Engliſh words, *father*, *part*, *graſs*. This ſeems to have been the only long power of this vowel in the Latin language. Ariſtides Quinctilianus * deſcribes this power of α, as a mean between its own full ſound, and the ſound of the η. And this is a moſt juſt deſcription of it. The ſound of η was that of *a* in the word *hate*. Let any one give thoſe three ſounds of the Engliſh *a* ſucceſſively *(ace, aſs, all)*, he will find that, having given the firſt ſound, he opens his mouth wider to give the ſecond, and wider ſtill to give the third. And this is the only difference. The ſecond, therefore, is a mean between the two extremes.

Ariſtides Quinctilianus obſerves, that this affinity between the α and the η, appearing in this middle power of α, gave occaſion

* Ariſtid. Quinct. apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 92.

both

both to the change of η into α, in the Doric dialect, which delighted in ſtrong maſculine ſounds; and to the contrary change of α into η by the Ionians, who more affected a ſoftened pronunciation. Hence it ſeems at leaſt a very probable concluſion, that it was the narrower long α, which the Ionians changed into η; and into which, η, on the contrary, was changed by the Dorians. And, if this may be aſſumed as a true principle, it will afford a rule for chooſing, in moſt caſes, with tolerable certainty, between the two powers of the long α. Obſerve in what caſes generally, and in what words in particular, the long α is changed into the η by the Ionic dialect. Every long α, which undergoes this change, ſhould be pronounced with the narrower ſound. But every long α, which the Ionic dialect leaves unchanged, carried the full broad power in the other dialects.

The ſame predilection for the ſtrong maſculine ſounds, which led the Dorians to change the η into the narrower long α, would lead them to change the narrow long α into the broad. And that preference of the ſofter ſounds, which led the Ionians to change the narrow long α into η, would lead them

them to change the ſound of the broad long α into that of the narrow. And thus the broad ſound would be expelled from their dialect. And, ſince the Ionic dialect was an offspring of the Attic; it ſeems highly probable, that the Attics were very ſparing in the broad ſound; which was almoſt confined to the Doric and Æolic dialects, and to poetry. It ſeems to be the caſe, in all languages, that as the people, who uſe them, grow polite and refined, the broad ſound of the *a* is reduced. At this day it is but little heard, in the French and Italian languages, as they are ſpoken by ſcholars and people of condition. That this broad ſound of the *a* was indeed the broadeſt, and moſt maſculine, of all ſounds, as it is deſcribed to be by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis, appears from the frequent change of ω into α in the Doric dialect. Τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν, they certainly pronounced *taun liparaun apo Thābaun*.

We generally pronounce this vowel long, both in Latin and in Greek, but with a power, which never belongs to it in either language; namely, with the power of the Engliſh *a*, in the words, *hate*, *late*, *date*; which is the true power of the Greek η. A final α, or *a* in Latin, ſome pronounce ſhort,

ſome

ſome long. But none make a diſtinction in Latin between the ſhort *a*, of the nominative caſes, and the long *a*, of the ablative ſingular in the firſt declenſion.

2. ε. This vowel is naturally ſhort, but capable of being lengthened by poſition. Its natural power is that of the Engliſh *e*, in the words *merry*, *cherry*, *bed*, *belly*.

3. η. This vowel is naturally long; and its true power is that of the French *e ouverte*, or of the letter *a* in the Engliſh words *hate*, *late*, *date*.

The Latin language has only the letter *e* to expreſs the ſounds both of ε and η. We generally pronounce ε (and the Latin *e*) long; and never give the η any other power, than that of the double *ee* Engliſh, which never belonged to it.

4. ι. This vowel has two powers; a ſhort, and a long. Its ſhort power is that of the letter *i*, in the Engliſh words, *hit*, *bit*, *kick*, *lick*. Its long power is that of the French *i*, hardly diſtinguiſhable from the power of the double *ee*, in the words, *beer*, *ſteer*. When we mean to make it

long, we give it the power of the letter *i*, in the Engliſh word *bite*; which never belonged to it.

The ſhort powers of the *e* and the *i*, in the antient languages, were ſometimes hardly to be diſtinguiſhed by the ear. Hence the Latins at firſt wrote *Menerva* for *Minerva*; *lever* for *levir*; *mageſter* for *magiſter**; which accounts for the tranſmutation of the Greek diphthongs, αι and οι, into æ and œ, in Latin.

5. *o*. This vowel is naturally ſhort, but capable of being lengthened by poſition. Its natural ſhort power is that of *o*, in the Engliſh words, *conſequence*, *comedy*, *common*.

6. *u*. This vowel has two powers; a long, and a ſhort. Its ſhort power is that of *u*, in the Engliſh words, *hut*, *cut*, *cuddle*, *puddle*. Its long power is that of the ſame letter, in the Engliſh words, *muſe*, *excuſe*, *refuſe*. We often give it the true ſhort power; but, when we mean to make it long, we give it the power of the French diphthong, *ou*. In the antient languages, there ſeems to have been the ſame affinity

* Quinctil. Lib. I. cap. 5.

between the ſhort powers of the *o* and *u*, as thoſe of the *e* and *i*. Hence the Latins at firſt wrote *Hecoba* for *Hecuba*; *Pulyxena* for *Polyxena*; and *dederont* for *dederunt**.

7. *ω*. This vowel is naturally long. Its power is that of the letter *o*, in the Engliſh words, *more*, *pore*, *glory*, *ſtory*.

The diphthongs *ου*, *ευ*, have the powers of the French diphthongs *ou*, *eu*, reſpectively. The diphthong *ει* has the power of the letter *i*, in the Engliſh word, *bite*. The diphthong *αυ* (*au* in Latin) has the power of the French diphthong *au*. The powers of the diphthongs *αι*, *οι*, when they were long, were very nearly, if not exactly, what we generally give them. When ſhort, it is probable, they were given with a ſound, not exactly the ſame, but barely diſtinguiſhable from that of the ſimple vowel, *ι*.

The powers of the diphthongs have been matter of much diſpute, among modern grammarians; and it muſt be confeſſed, they are a ſubject of ſome uncertainty. Some have imagined, that the ſound of the diph-

* Quinctil. Lib. I. cap. 5.

thong

thong differed not ſenſibly from the ſimple ſound of one or other of the two vowels, of which it was compounded; and, that this was particularly the caſe, in the diphthongs αι, ει, and οι. The truth ſeems to be, that, in a diphthong, the ſound of the two vowels was not heard apart, as in οἴω. For then each vowel made a ſyllable by itſelf, and there was no diphthong. In a diphthong, therefore, the ſound was as much one, as the ſound of a ſingle vowel. But yet, that one ſound was not the ſound of any one of the ſimple vowels. The contrary opinion ſeems to be a miſtake, ariſing out of this circumſtance. There were originally two combinations of the vowel *i*, with the vowels *a*, *e*, or *o*, preceding. In the one, it formed a diphthong. In the other, the vowel *i* had merely the effect of lengthening the power of the preceding vowel, without at all mixing ſound with it. In Greek, after the introduction of the ſmall characters, and the long vowels; this ι, which had only this lengthening power, was removed from the ſide of the preceding vowel, and marked by a point under it; and ſo became the *iota ſubſcript*; thus—ᾳ for -AI, -ῃ for -EI, -ῳ for -OI. Before this diſtinction was introduced,

On what authority

it muſt often have been doubtful, whether the I in -AI, -EI, or -OI, was only a mark of length of the preceding vowel, or the latter half of a diphthong. And thence it might become a practice, with inaccurate ſpeakers, or readers, to confound the ſound of theſe diphthongs with that of the ſimple vowels *α*, *ε*, *ο*. But, whenever the *ι* keeps its place, at the ſide of any one of theſe vowels, in the ſmall character; the two form a diphthong, to be pronounced according to the rules we have laid down; and not as the ſimple vowel. Were it otherwiſe, why was not the *ι*, annexed to theſe letters, in all caſes turned into the *iota ſubſcript*? Originally, there was certainly but one way of writing the dative ſingular, and the nominative plural, of nouns in -*ος*, of the third declenſion; namely, with the termination -*οι*. ΕΚΓΟΝΟΙ, for inſtance, was both the dative ſingular, and nominative plural of ΕΚΓΟΝΟΣ. But, in a more improved ſtate of the Greek orthography, the dative ſingular was written *ἐκγόνῳ*; but the nominative plural continued *ἔκγονοι*. Whereas, if the ſound of theſe two caſes had been as much the ſame, as the more antient way of writing; the more antient way of writing ſhould

ſhould have been changed in neither, or the new way in both adopted. But the new way of writing being adopted in one caſe, while, in the other, the old way was retained; the concluſion ſeems certain, that the ſounds were different; the one properly expreſſed by the diphthong; the other, by the long power of the ſimple vowel.

It is admitted, however, that the ſounds of the diphthongs αι and οι, when ſhort, not by poetical licence, but by uſe, (as they were whenever they were final, except in optative moods, in adverbs, and in contracted and in circumflexed ſyllables), was but barely diſtinguiſhable from that of the ſimple vowel ι. That there muſt have been a difference, between the long and the ſhort ſound, is ſelf-evident. That the ſhort ſound was ſuch as has been deſcribed, a paſſage, in Ariſtides Quinctilianus*, corrupt indeed, and inexplicable without conjectural emendaon, affords, not certain proof, but a very probable argument. Speaking of the reciprocal tranſmutations of the vowels α and η into each other, in the Doric and Ionic dialects, he ſays —ἡ δὲ ἰὰς, τὸ ϛερεὸν ὑποϛελλομένη τῷ ᾱ, καὶ ἀφαιρέσει πρὸς τὸ η̄." " The Ionic, avoiding

* Ariſtid. Quinct. apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 93.

the ſtrong ſound of the α, deſcends to η." Then he adds, as we now read him, τὸ δὲ θῆλυ μὲν ἐϛι καλὰ τὸ πλεῖϛον, ὡς προείρηϛαι· τὸ δὲ τὸν ὅμοιον ἦχον ἐπιφέροιεν, εἰ ἐκταθείη τῇ αι διφθόγγῳ, γραφομένη διὰ τοῦ α, ἐπ' ἐλάχιϛον ἠρρένωϛαι. This paſſage is certainly unintelligible, as it ſtands. The following emendation may perhaps ſeem plauſible—τοῦτο δὲ θῆλυ μὲν ἐϛι, καλὰ τὸ πλεῖϛον, ὡς προείρηϛαι. Τὸ δὲ Ι τὸν ὅμοιον ἦχον ἐμφέροιεν τῷ Ε εἰ ἐκλαθείη· ἐν δὲ τῇ αι διφθόγγῳ, διὰ τοῦ α ἐγγραφομένε, ἐπ' ἐλάχιϛον ἠρρένωϛαι. "But this, "(namely η) is feminine for the moſt part, "as has been ſaid before. The letter ι ex- "hibits a ſound, which would reſemble the "ε, if [ε] could be prolonged. But, in the "diphthong αι, it is rendered in ſome very "ſmall degree maſculine, by the power of "the α written in the diphthong*." The paſſage, if theſe corrections be admitted, deſcribes a power of the diphthong αι, in which the ι was the predominant ſound. The α made a part of the written character, but had no other effect upon the ſound, than to give ſome ſmall degree of ſtrength to the ι, which it poſſeſſed not naturally.

* Meibonius propoſed the change of τὸ into τοῦτο, at the beginning of the firſt clauſe, and to inſert Ι between δὲ and τὸν, in the ſecond. But he thought of no farther alteration.

The

The ſound of the ι, therefore, thus modified, was not quite the ſame with that of the ſimple vowel, and yet the difference was very ſmall. For the ſtrength added to it was the leaſt poſſible. The diphthong αι, therefore, had a power little different from that of the vowel ι. And, by analogy, the ſame thing may be concluded of the dipthong οι. But the reaſon of the thing requires, that this power ſhould be aſcribed to theſe two diphthongs, only in their ſhort ſtate. It muſt be added, that, in the long ſound of the diphthong αι, it muſt have been the narrow ſound of the long α, that was blended with the ſound of ι. For a ſound, compounded of the broad ſound of α with ι, would not ſenſibly differ from the long ſound of the diphthong οι.

Thoſe, who, without diſtinguiſhing between the long and the ſhort powers, contend, that the diphthongs αι and οι had invariably the ſound of ſimple vowels; the diphthong αι, that of ε; and οι, that of ι; rely chiefly for proof of the aſſertion, with reſpect to the diphthong αι, upon a remark of Euſtathius's upon the ſecond line of the firſt Iliad:

Ουλομένην ἡ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε.

Euſtathius obſerves, that Homer was very ſparing in the uſe of that play, upon correſponding ſounds, in which ſome delighted. Otherwiſe he had a fine opportunity of playing off the trick, in this line; where he might have written, Αχαίοις ἄχε' ἔθηκε. In which caſe ἄχε' would have echoed to Αχαίοις. Thence they conclude, that -χε and -χαι were the ſame ſounds. But the ſimilarity of ſound, of which Euſtathius ſpeaks, muſt depend entirely upon ἀχ-, the firſt ſyllable of both words. For, ε was ſhort, and αι long. And a ſhort and a long ſound could never be the ſame. It is true, a ſyllable, in which the vowel was ſhort, might be lengthened, without any change in the power of the vowel, by the mere effect of the conſonants following the vowel. But this is not the caſe in this inſtance. For the diphthong αι, in the word Αχαιοις, is followed by no conſonant; and yet, being long, could be long only by its own ſound, which was neceſſarily different, therefore, from that of ε.

For proof of the aſſertion with reſpect to the diphthong οι, they appeal to no leſs authority, than that of Thucydides; who, men-

mentioning an oracular verſe, which, upon the breaking out of the plague of Athens, was applied to that calamity:

Ἥξει Δωριακὸς πόλεμος καὶ λοιμὸς ἅμ' αὐτῷ,

ſays, as they interpret him, that it was diſputed, whether this verſe related to a peſtilence, or to a famine. Whence they conclude, that λοιμὸς and λιμὸς muſt have been words of the ſame ſound, and, of conſequence, that the ſound of οι and ι was the ſame. But the words of Thucydides, rightly interpreted, warrant the contrary concluſion. Thucydides ſays, "that, upon the appear-"ance of the plague, people recollected "that verſe, which, the old men ſaid, their "forefathers had been uſed to ſing. But "then it became a diſpute, whether the "word in the verſe *had been pronounced* * λοι-"μὸς or λιμὸς, peſtilence or famine, by the "antients [παλαιῶν, men of the former ge-"neration]." The diſpute was not about the interpretation of a word, to the ear confeſſedly the ſame; but which of two words had been in the mouths of their forefathers, when they repeated this verſe. And

* Ἐγένετο μὲν οὖν ἔρις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ λοιμὸν ὀνομάσθαι ἐν τῷ ἔπει ὑπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν, ἀλλὰ λιμόν.

this ſuppoſes, that the words were diſtinct. And this is confirmed by what he adds, "that the event naturally led them to give "it in favour of λοιμὸς, as the word that "had been uttered [ἐιρῆσθαι]. But I ſup-"poſe," ſays he, "if another Dorian war "ſhould at any time break out, and a fa-"mine ſhould happen, they will then, pro-"bably, ſing it in that manner [ἄτως ᾄσου-"ϛαι];" i. e. with the word λιμὸς, not with λοιμός. Had the diſpute been about the interpretation of the word, Thucydides would have ſaid, they will *interpret* it in that manner. But when he ſays, they will *ſing* it in that manner, it is manifeſtly implied, that λοιμὸς and λιμὸς were different ſounds. For had the ſounds been perfectly the ſame, the manner of ſinging could not be different. And, if the ſounds of theſe words were different, οι and ι muſt have had different ſounds; for theſe are the only characters, in which the two words differ.

That the diphthongs ει, ου, had not the ſound of either of the ſimple vowels ε, ο, as ſome have imagined, appears from the reaſon, which Euſtathius aſſigns for the antient names of theſe vowels; which names were

were ει and ου. "It is to be obſerved," he ſays, "that the antients called the letter ε, εῖ; "adding an *iota* to it, that, by the length "of the diphthong, they might be able to "circumflex this letter, as well as the "others. And the like they do with the "ο *micron*; for that too, for the ſame rea- "ſon, they call οῦ*." The diphthongs, therefore, ει and ου, had each a ſound, which was capable of the circumflex; of which the ſounds of the ſimple vowels ε, and ο, were incapable. The ſounds, therefore, were different.

Dawes.

And it ſeems almoſt equally evident, that the ſounds of theſe two diphthongs muſt have been different from thoſe of the other ſimple vowels, ι and υ, which entered into the compoſition. For, if it may ſeem ſtrange (as indeed it may), that a compound ſound ſhould be uſed as the name of a ſimple vowel, which was the caſe while theſe diphthongs were the names of ſimple vowels; it would be much more ſtrange, if one ſimple ſound had been made to ſtand for the name of another. And yet this would have been the caſe, had the diphthongs ει and ου, which were the antient names of the vowels

* Euſtath. in Il. Ε. ſub initio.

ε and ο, given the ſimple ſound of the vowels ι, υ.

Some inconveniences, probably, that were found to ariſe, from giving ſimple ſounds the names of compounds, gave occaſion to the more artificial nomenclature of later grammarians. In which the names of *e pſilon* and *u pſilon*, impoſed on ε and υ, afford another preſumptive argument of the difference between the power of ſimple vowels and diphthongs. For theſe names ſeem to point out the *nudity* of theſe elements, taken by themſelves, uncloathed with any adventitious ſound, as a circumſtance of the firſt importance. Whereas, it was a circumſtance of no importance at all, if any diphthong gave the mere ſound of theſe vowels, pure and unadulterated. The epithet ψιλον, upon that ſuppoſition, had no meaning.

It is contended, however, that Euſtathius affords inconteſtable proof, that the ſound of the diphthong ει differed not from that of the ſimple vowel ι, in his note upon the 406th verſe of the firſt Iliad. In which he alleges line 274,

Ἀλλὰ πίθισθε καὶ ὔμμες, ἐπεὶ πείθισθαι ἄμεινον,

as

as exhibiting an inſtance of a perfect re-echoing of ſound, in the words πίθεσθε and πείθεσθαι. Which he certainly mentions as a παρήχησις πάνυ ταυτόφωνος. But it is moſt manifeſt, that this entire identity of ſound could only obtain in the two latter ſyllables, -θεσθε and -θεσθαι; where the parecheſis would indeed be very complete. For, the diphthong αι, in the infinitive mood, being ſhort, would differ little in ſound from the ſimple ſhort ι; and, of conſequence, very little from the ſimple ε. But the ſound of πι- and πει- could never be the ſame. For, ι in πίθεσθε is ſhort, and ει in πείθεσθαι is long; though the poſition of the vowel, in one word, and the diphthong, in the other, is exactly the ſame; the vowel and the diphthong being both followed, in their reſpective words, by the ſame conſonant, θ. Neither the brevity, therefore, of the one, nor the length of the other, was the effect of poſition; but ι was ſhort by uſe, and ει long by nature. The ſounds, therefore, were certainly different.

Again the ſound of the diphthong ευ was certainly different from that either of the ſimple υ, or of the ſimple ε. For, Euſtathius informs

informs us, that it was for the ſake of euphony, that this diphthong was often changed into υ, and ſometimes into ι*. A change, therefore, was made in the ſound, by thoſe tranſmutations, or no euphony could have been produced. The commuted ſounds, therefore, were different.

Upon the whole, it ſeems indiſputable, that every diphthong had its proper ſound, different from that of any of the ſimple vowels; though, in the caſe of diphthongs, having by uſe a ſhort power, the difference became evaneſcent. Every vowel too had its proper power, diſtinct from the proper power of any other vowel. And yet, partly by the caprice of cuſtom, partly by the inaccuracy of vernacular pronunciation, the differences were, in many particular inſtances, confounded. It ſhould ſeem, from Euſtathius †, that the diphthong αι was ſometimes hardly to be diſtinguiſhed from η, or ᾰι from ι. And that η and ι were ſometimes confounded. The moſt extraordinary tautophony, which he mentions, is that of the vowels ι and η, in the proper names of

* Euſtath. in Od. A. 18. † Il. A. 406.

the

the goddeſſes, Ιρις and Ηρη. It muſt be obſerved, however, that, upon this ſubject of the powers of the vowels and diphthongs, Euſtathius is not entitled to the ſame degree of credit, when he ſpeaks upon his own bare authority, as when he reports to us the deciſions of the antient grammarians. Upon the ſubject of pronunciation, when he ſpeaks without the antients for his guides, he might often be deceived by the bad habits of his own times: in which a vile *iotaciſm* had gained conſiderable ground, which at laſt reduced almoſt all the vowels, but particularly the η, to the ſhort power of the ι. But no two ſounds could be more different and diſtinct, than the proper ſounds of theſe two vowels, before the Greeks loſt their gennine pronunciation. This is manifeſt, beyond all doubt, from the very accurate and philoſophical expoſition of the powers of the ſeven vowels, which Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis has given in the 14th ſection περι Συνθες. And that the difference between η and ι, marked in this deſcription, ſubſiſted in its full force in later times, in the times of Ariſtides Quinctilianus, appears from the compariſon made by that author, which we have mentioned above, between the

the powers of η and α. It may ſeem, too, that Euſtathius is to be underſtood, not of a general identity of the powers of the vowels and diphthongs, which he compares; but of tautophonies in the particular inſtances of thoſe words only, which he mentions. The modern, however, if he can aſcertain the proper powers of the ſeveral vowels and diphthongs, muſt keep to the general rule; for, the arbitrary deviations of cuſtom, in the preſent ſtate of the language, are irrecoverably loſt.

When once the habit is acquired of giving the vowels their proper powers, in every ſituation; the next thing, to which we ſhould attend, in the recitation of Greek, is the effect of the fundamental rules of accent upon the tones of words in connection; which we take to have been ſuch, that the tone was not, in all caſes, without exception, to be given upon the ſyllable, upon which the accent (i. e. the mark) was placed, which, with few exceptions, was that on which the tone was ſounded in the ſolitary word.

It is very certain, that the tones of words, in connection, were not always the ſame with

with the tones of the ſolitary words. The difference is remarkable, in the caſe of oxytons; which, except in particular ſituations, where their connection with other words is interrupted, entirely loſt the acute accent, and were ſpoken with a perfect monotony from beginning to end; though many of them conſiſted of many ſyllables. Many of the fourteen atonous monoſyllables acquired tone, in certain ſituations. It was in conſequence of certain definite ſituations, that the enclitics loſt their own tones, and affected the tones of the word next preceding. The oxyton ἐς became a paroxyton in certain ſituations; and the ſame thing happened to moſt of the oxytonous prepoſitions. All theſe are inſtances of the effect of the connection of words in ſentences, what Laſcaris calls the συνέπεια, to change, what may be called, the natural tone, that is, the tone of the ſolitary word.

It muſt be confeſſed, that, in theſe caſes, the change of the tone was always indicated, by a correſponding alteration, or removal, of the mark; which may ſeem an argument, that no change of tone ever took place, without a correſponding change, or removal, of the accent. But it is to be obſerved, that

the words, in which the accent was removed, or changed, to indicate a change of tone, were few in number. The ſituations, in which the change took place, were few and definite; and the words, ſuch only, as conſiſted of not more than two ſyllables. And the change, in theſe circumſtances, aroſe not from any thing in the theory of tone and of accentuation itſelf, which required it, but was matter of mere uſage. No inconvenience, therefore, aroſe, in theſe caſes, from the change, or removal, of the mark. The ſituation, of the accent in the ſolitary word (which was alſo its ſituation in all but theſe definite arrangements), would eaſily be remembered. And had the accent not been changed or altered, there had been nothing to admoniſh the reader of the change, that he was to make in the tone of his voice, but his own memory of an arbitrary rule; which muſt always be, in a great degree, precarious. But the changes, which we ſuppoſe to have been produced, in the tones of words in connection, from the very nature of tone, and the theory of accentuation, were incident to all words, in which the quantity of the laſt ſyllable was liable to be changed by poſition. An alteration of the accentual

mark, in every ſuch caſe, would have introduced great confuſion and uncertainty about the accentuation of the ſolitary word; eſpecially, as the change, in theſe caſes, aroſe from theory, and the collocation of the accent, in the ſolitary word, was very often a matter of uſage. The accent, therefore, in theſe caſes, was very properly ſuffered to remain unaltered. And from this no inconvenience followed. For, as the change of tone was required in theſe caſes, by the rules of accent; the place and ſpecies of the tone was as clearly marked to the reader, by the accentuation of the ſolitary word, as it would have been, had the accent been changed, or removed, to expreſs what may be called the ſpecific tone of the individual connection. If it ſhould be aſked, what proof we have, that the ſpecies or place of the tone was ever changed, when we find no change of the written accent, the anſwer is plain; that the changes of tone, for which we contend, are nothing more than ſo many applications of the fundamental rules of accent; which were violated, if ſuch changes, in the caſes we have ſuppoſed, did not take place. And we may add, that we have, in confirmation of our opinion,

that they did take place, the analogy of the Latin practice, and the authority of Quinctilian. "It happens," ſays Quinctilian, "that the ſtructure of the verſe alters "the accent. As,

"Pecudes pictæque volucres,

"for I muſt read volúcres, with an acute "tone upon the middle ſyllable. Becauſe "though it is ſhort by nature, yet by poſi- "tion it is long; that it may not make an "Iamb, which the heroic verſe admits not. "But theſe [words] taken ſeparately muſt "not deviate from our rule. Otherwiſe, if "cuſtom ſhould prevail, the antient rule of "ſpeech will be aboliſhed." The rule of which he ſpeaks, is the rule of accentuation, which he delivers in the next following ſentence. The "cuſtom" is the cuſtom, which began to be introduced in his time, of giving an acute accent upon the laſt ſyllable of certain words. He adds, "the obſervance "of this (i. e. the antient rule of ſpeaking) "is *more difficult among the Greeks*, becauſe "they have various ways of ſpeaking, which "they call *Dialects*;" and becauſe "what is "*ſometimes* vicious, upon *other occaſions* is "right." Here we are informed, by Quinctilian,

lian, that, in the Latin language, the ſtructure of a verſe would, by the effect of arrangement and connection, modify the tones of words, and make them, in a certain caſe, different from the tones of the ſolitary word. And he aſſerts, that this difference, between the tones of the connected and the ſolitary word, was a matter of much more difficulty, becauſe it was much more frequent, in the Greek, than in the Latin language. Indeed, if the Latin ſyſtem of accentuation had any advantage over the Greek, it conſiſted in this ſingle circumſtance; that any difference of tone, between the ſolitary and the connected word, took place only in poetry; and in that, only in a ſingle caſe; namely, when the penultima of a word, of more than two ſyllables, was lengthened by the poetical licence. This advantage is greatly overbalanced by many diſadvantages, on the ſide of the Latin ſyſtem. But to dwell upon theſe would be beſide our preſent purpoſe. It is ſufficient, that we have ſhewn, that in advancing, what certainly will ſeem a novel notion, that the tones of words in the Greek language were frequently modified and altered by their relative ſituations; and that a critical attention to theſe alterations made

the chief part of the difficulty of ſpeaking the language with propriety; we only reaſſert, for the firſt time, perhaps, ſince the revival of letters, what was aſſerted by Quinctilian, at a time when the Greek was a living language, and the true pronunciation of it, if in ſome few circumſtances depraved, was upon the whole preſerved. We now, in place of any farther argument, will ſubjoin an enumeration of the changes, which we conceive the tones of connected words to have undergone; which will at the ſame time ſerve for illuſtration and proof of what has been advanced, and for a rule of pronunciation.

I.

The final ſyllable of every verſe being long by poſition (with the exception, indeed, of the verſes of the lyric poets), if the laſt word of a verſe be a proparoxyton, the acute tone muſt be given on the penult. Thus, in the verſe,

Οὐλομένην ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,

the laſt word, ἔθηκε, is to be pronounced ἐθήκε. Becauſe the acute accent cannot fall upon the

the antepenult of any word, when the laſt ſyllable is long.

II.

If the laſt word of a verſe be an anticircumflexed word, the ſimple acute tone muſt be given on the penult. Thus, in the verſe,

Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος,

the word, Αχιλῆος, muſt be pronounced Ἀχιλήος. For the penult cannot take a circumflex, when the laſt ſyllable of the word is a long ſyllable.

III.

If, in any part of a verſe, the laſt ſyllable of a proparoxyton be lengthened by poſition; the acute tone muſt be given upon the penult. Thus, in the verſe,

Ὣς ἔφατ' ἔδδεισεν δ' ὁ γέρων καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ,

the word, ἔδδεισεν, ſhould be pronounced ἐδδείσεν.

IV.

If, in any part of a verſe, the laſt ſyllable of an anticircumflexed word be lengthened by poſition; the ſimple acute tone, inſtead

of the circumflex, muſt be given upon the penult. Thus, in the verſe,

Ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον τὸ μὲν ἔποτε φύλλα κ᾽ ὄζους,

the word, σκῆπτρον, muſt be pronounced σκήπτρον.

V.

The Greek poets had a licence unknown to the Latins. Poſition not only lengthened ſhort vowels; but occaſionally it ſhortened long vowels, and diphthongs. When the final vowel, or diphthong, of a circumflexed word is ſhortened by poſition; the word becomes, in that particular circumſtance, oxytonous. For it is not only againſt rule, but impoſſible in the nature of things, that a ſhort ſyllable ſhould receive the circumflex. Thus, in the verſe,

Μεσσηγὺς γαίης τε κ᾽ ὐρανῦ ἀστερόεντος,

Il. E. 769.

the word, ὐρανῦ, muſt be pronounced with the monotony of an oxyton, ὐρανὺ.

So again in the verſe,

Θεσπεσίῳ ἀλαλητῷ ὑφ᾽ Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο,

Il. Σ. 149.

the word ἀλαλητῷ muſt be pronounced as an oxyton, ἀλαλητώ.

VI.

VI.

If the final long vowel, or diphthong, of a paroxyton be ſhortened by poſition; the lengthened ſound of the circumflex muſt be given in full ſtrength upon the penult. Thus, in the verſe,

Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοί περ,
Il. Σ. 112.

the word, προτετύχθαι, ſhould be pronounced προτετῦχθαι.

VII.

If a paroxyton, terminating in a ſhort vowel, ſuffers an eliſion of the final vowel before the initial vowel of the next word, the acute accent keeps its place; but what is left of the word, muſt be pronounced as an oxyton; the penult, by the eliſion, being the final ſyllable of all that is left of the word. Thus, in this verſe,

Ἤ εἰ δή ποτέ τοι κατὰ πίονα μηρί' ἔκηα,

the mutilated word, μηρί', muſt be pronounced μηρὶ'.

VIII.

VIII.

If a proparoxyton ſuffer the like eliſion, and the penult be a ſhort ſyllable ; the acute accent on the antepenult muſt take the lengthened ſound of the circumflex. Thus, in the verſe,

Λίσσομαι εἵνεκ' ἐμεῖο μένειν πάρ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ἄλλοι,

εἵνεκ' ſhould be ſounded εἷνεκ'.

IX.

When the cæſura of a verſe falls upon the final ſyllable of an oxyton, the acute accent ſhould be given upon that ſyllable. For, the cæſura breaks the connection (the συνέπεια) as effectually as a ſtop. This always gives the verſe a grand and lofty ſound, if the cæſura be of the firſt or third ſpecies, falling upon a long ſyllable after the ſecond or third foot. If the cæſura be of the ſecond ſpecies, falling upon a troch after the ſecond foot, the ſound is leſs maſculine, but not diſpleaſing.

Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ | Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλῆος.

Νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦρσε κακήν· | ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί

Δεινὴ

Δεινὴ δὲ κλαγγὴ | γένετ' ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο.

Τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ | λευκώλενος Ἥρη,

Μή σε, γέρον, κοίλῃσιν ἐγὼ | παρὰ νηυσὶ κιχείω.

These are noble ſpecimens of the firſt ſort. Of the ſecond are theſe;

Ἐκλαγξαν δ' ἄρ' ὀϊστοὶ | ἐπ' ὤμων χωομένοιο

Ἀρσαντες καλὰ θυμόν, | ὅπως ἀνταξιον ἔσται.

An inſtance of the cæſura of the fourth ſpecies, namely, that which falls upon a troch after the third foot, it is believed, occurs not in Homer,

X.

When a paroxyton has a vowel, long by nature, in the laſt ſyllable, and a vowel, ſhort by nature, in the penult, without any conſonant between the two; it ſometimes happens, though not always, nor even for the moſt part, but ſometimes it happens, that the two ſyllables are made one, by a ſynecphoneſis of the two vowels. In this caſe, the acute tone is to be thrown back upon the preceding ſyllable. Thus, in the verſe,

Χρυσέῳ

Χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ ϗ ἐλίσσετο πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς.

Il. A. 15.

the two laſt ſyllables of the paroxyton, Χρυσέῳ, namely, -σε- and ῳ, become one; and, what ſeems extraordinary, a ſhort one, by a ſynecphoneſis of the vowels, ε and ῳ. For thus the verſe is ſcanned:

Χρῡσε̆ῳ ἀ̆- | νᾱ σκῆπ- | τρῷ καῖ ἐ̆- | λῑσσε̆τŏ | πᾱ́ντᾰς Ἀ̆- | χᾱιοῦς.

σεῷ forming the middle ſyllable of a dactyl. The word, χρυσέῳ, therefore, in this place, muſt be ſounded χρύσεῳ. Again, in the verſe,

Ἄςυ περιπλομένων δῆϊων ὑπὸ θυμοραϊςέων,

Il. Σ. 220.

we have two paroxytons, δῆϊων and θυμοραιςέων, in each of which the two final ſyllables are made one, by a ſynecphoneſis of the vowels; ι, ω, in the former; ε, ω, in the latter. Theſe two words, therefore, ſhould be ſounded δήϊων and θυμοραΐςεων.

It might ſeem, at firſt ſight, that, in theſe caſes, the acute accent upon the ſhort vowel, with the grave upon the long, ſhould be turned, by the ſynecphoneſis, into

to a circumflex. And this was Dr. Clarke's opinion; for he ſays, that the word θυμοραιξέων was pronounced θυμοραϊξῶν. But he is miſtaken. This was, indeed, the practice of the Romans, in their recitation of Greek, in the time of Quinctilian. But Quinctilian cenſures it, as a bad practice, and an innovation. For he ſays, that, when he was a young man, the pronunciation of the very learned old men was Ἄτρευς, not Ἀτρεῦς. And Quinctilian's judgement is confirmed by the inſtance of the word χρυσεῳ, in which the ſyllable -εω, being ſhortened by poſition, cannot receive the tone of the circumflex.

It is to be obſerved, that Dr. Clarke, and many very learned grammarians, have imagined, that the rules of accent, reſpecting the quantity of the final ſyllable, were to be underſtood as reſpecting only the natural quantity of the vowel of that ſyllable. And that, notwithſtanding thoſe rules, the acute tone might be given upon the antepenult, if the final ſyllable was long only by poſition: and that the circumflex might be given upon the penult, if the vowel of the laſt ſyllable, being ſhort by nature or by uſe, was lengthened only by poſition. Of which the words

αὔλαξ,

αὖλαξ, χοῖνιξ, καλαῦροψ, are given as inſtances. Writers, upon the ſubject of accent, had very generally alleged thoſe words, as exceptions to that general rule, which excludes the circumflex from the penult, when the laſt ſyllable is long. Dr. Clarke contends, that theſe words are injudiciouſly made exceptions; becauſe the rule, as he would have it, regards only the natural length of the final vowel; and, in theſe words, the final vowel is lengthened only by poſition. See Dr. Clarke, ad I. B. 267. If Dr. Clarke's diſtinction be admiſſible, with reſpect to the marks; it is abſolutely falſe, if it be extended to the tones expreſſed by thoſe marks. Falſe, becauſe it is contrary, not only to poſitive rules, but to the nature of things, on which thoſe primary rules were founded. It is impoſſible to give the time and the tone of the circumflex on the penult, without either ſhortening the ſound of the final ſyllable, or ſounding the two, as diſtinct monoſyllables. The tone of the circumflex, therefore, muſt not be given on the penult, when the final ſyllable is long, whether its length be inherent in the nature of the vowel, or merely incidental, ariſing from poſition. For to

ſhorten

ſhorten a ſound, which ought to be long, whatever the reaſon of the length may be, muſt be a vicious pronunciation. So it is impoſſible to give the tone of the acute accent upon the antepenult, without a tendency to ſhorten the final ſyllable. The tone of the acute accent, therefore, muſt not be given upon the antepenult, when the final ſyllable is long, whatever be the cauſe of the length, whether nature or poſition. A diſtinction, however, is to be made between thoſe poſitions, which neceſſarily lengthen an ambiguous vowel (ſuch is its poſition before two mutes) and thoſe poſitions, which render it only capable of being lengthened, at the pleaſure of the poet. This is the ſituation of the vowels α, ι, and υ, before ξ. The terminations, therefore, -αξ, -ιξ, and υξ, were, in many words, ſhort by uſe. And when they are ſo, the penult, if long, if it take any accent, muſt take the circumflex. And the effect of the circumflex muſt be given on the penult, except in thoſe caſes, where the final ſyllable is lengthened by the poet, or by being placed next before another word beginning with a conſonant. The words, therefore, αὖλαξ, φοῖνιξ, χοῖνιξ,

to

to which others might be added, are indeed, as Dr. Clarke obſerves, no exceptions to the general rule; but not for the reaſon he aſſigns. They are not exceptions, becauſe they take the circumflex upon the penult regularly, by virtue of the general rule, the final ſyllable being ſhort by uſe, and lengthened only occaſionally by the poets. Dr. Clarke's notion, that the length of the final ſyllable was regarded only when it was natural to the vowel, not when it was produced by poſition, is not at all confirmed by his examples of οἰκόν σε, οἰκόν με. For, in theſe examples, the vowel in the final ſyllable of οἰκον being ſhort by nature, the mark of the circumflex remains upon the firſt ſyllable, notwithſtanding that the ſhort vowel is lengthened by poſition; becauſe the poſition, in this inſtance, is not the póſition of the vowel in the word itſelf, but with relation to another word; a circumſtance, which the general rule could not embrace. To the rule forbidding the acute accent upon the antepenult, when the final ſyllable is long, it is doubted whether a ſingle exception is to be found; unleſs it be of certain words in the Attic declenſion, which rightly conſidered are no exceptions, and of words,

words, in which the vowel of the final ſyllable, being ſhort by nature or by uſe, is lengthened by its poſition, not in the word itſelf, but with reſpect to the word, that happens to follow it. And theſe are no exceptions; ſuch poſitions being no part of the object of the general rule. The general rules of accents regard only the tones of the ſolitary word: and theſe tones, from the very nature of tone and time, are often modified and changed, in various ways, by the relative ſituations of words in ſentences. And hence ariſe the differences between the conſtant tones of the ſolitary word, and its occaſional tones in particular connections, ſtated in the nine rules which we have laid down.

Theſe differences and modifications are of principal importance in the recitation of poetry; but they are, perhaps, not entirely to be neglected in proſe; if we would preſerve the rhythm of the periods, of which the orators were ſo ſtudious. The laſt ſyllable of a ſentence, like the laſt ſyllable of an hexameter verſe, is long by poſition; and for the ſame reaſon. The firſt rule, therefore, and the ſecond, obtained, perhaps, equally in verſe and proſe. The third and the

fourth rule alſo; the ſeventh and the eighth, might obtain, in ſome degree, in proſe; but would, for the moſt part, be neglected in the middle parts of a period, where they would be of very little importance. The fifth and ſixth rules obtain in verſe only. For in proſe, a vowel and a diphthong, long by nature, is in no circumſtances ſhortened. Tne 10th rule muſt have obtained in proſe, if the concurrent vowels were pronounced with a ſynecphoneſis. But this, perhaps, was pretty much at the diſcretion of the ſpeaker. If he gave the vowels ſeparately, the rule had no place. In the difference, which we have endeavoured to eſtabliſh between the accent of the ſolitary word, and the tones of connection, the diſtinction lay, as we conceive, ſo often mentioned by the antient grammarians, and ſo little underſtood by later critics, between accent and modulation. Accent marked the tone of the ſolitary word. Modulation was the *effect of accent upon words in connection.*

For the farther illuſtration of our ſcheme of pronunciation, the reader is preſented with forty lines of Homer, in two columns. The column to the left gives the words with their

their proper accents, as they ſtand in the beſt editions. In the adjacent column on the right, the marks of the accent are changed, and tranſpoſed, to exhibit the actual tones of the words, in their reſpective places, according to thoſe changes and modifications, which their relative ſituations, according to our theory, muſt produce. This is given merely as a praxis upon our rules of recitation; not as a method of placing the accents in writing, or printing, which we would recommend. The written or printed accents ought to follow the general rule, not the incidental peculiarities of arrangement.

Il. Σ. Lin. 138.

Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσασα, πάλιν τράπεθ' υἷος ἑοῖο
Καὶ ςρεφθεῖσ', ἁλίῃσι κασιγνήτῃσι μετηύδα·
Ὑμεῖς μὲν νῦν δῦτε θαλάσσης εὐρέα κόλπον
Ὀψόμεναί τε γέρονθ' ἅλιον καὶ δώματα πατρὸς,
Καὶ οἱ πάντ' ἀγορεύσατ'· ἐγὼ δ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον
Εἶμι παρ' Ἥφαιςον κλυτοτέχνην, αἴκ' ἐθέλῃσιν
Ὑιεῖ ἐμῷ δόμεναι κλυτὰ τεύχεα παμφανόωντα.
Ὡς ἔφαθ'· αἱ δ' ὑπὸ κῦμα θαλάσσης αὐτίκ' ἔδυσαν
Ἡ δ' αὖτ' Ουλυμπόνδε θεὰ Θέτις ἀγυρόπεζα
Ἤϊεν, ὄφρα φίλῳ παιδὶ κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἐνείκοι.
Τὴν μὲν ἄρ' Ὀυλυμπόνδε πόδες φέρον· αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ
Θεσπεσίῳ ἀλαλητῷ ὑφ' Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
Φεύγοντες, νῆάς τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκοντο.
Ουδέ κε Πάτροκλόν περ ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
Ἐκ βελέων ἐρύσαντο νέκυν, θεράποντ' Ἀχιλῆος
Αὖτις γὰρ δὴ τόν γε κίχον λαός τε καὶ ἵπποι,
Ἕκτωρ τε Πριάμοιο πάϊς, φλογὶ εἴκελος ἀλκήν.
Τρὶς μέν μιν μετόπισθε ποδῶν λάβε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
Ἑλκέμεναι μεμαὼς, μέγα δὲ Τρώεσσιν ὁμόκλα·
Τρὶς δὲ δύ' Αἴαντες, θοῦριν ἐπιειμένοι ἀλκήν
Νεκροῦ ἀπεςυφέλιξαν· ὁ δ' ἔμπεδον ἀλκὶ πεποιθὼς,
Ἄλλοτ' ἐπαΐξασκε κατὰ μόθον, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
Στάσκε μέγα ἰάχων· ὀπίσω δ' οὐ χάζετο πάμπαν.
Ὡς δ' ἀπὸ σώματος οὔτι λέοντ' αἴθωνα δύνανται

Ποιμένες

Il. Σ. Lin. 138.

Ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασα, πάλιν τράπετ' υἱος ἑοῖο
Καὶ ςρεφθεῖσ', ἀλίῃσι ναισιγνήτῃσι μεθηύδα·
Ὑμεῖς μὲν νῦν δῦτε θαλάσσης εὐρέα κόλπον
Ὀψόμεναί τε γέροντ' ἀλίον καὶ δώματα πατρὸς,
Καί οἱ πάντ' ἀγορεῦσατ'· ἐγὼ δ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον
Εἶμι παρ' Ἡφαίςου κλυτοτέχνην, αἴκ' ἐθελήσιν
Υἱεῖ ἐμῷ δομέναι κλυτὰ τεύχεα παμφανόωντα.
Ὣς ἔφατ'· αἱ δ' ὑπὸ κῦμα θαλάσσης αὐτίκ' ἰδύσαν.
Ἡ δ' αὖτ' Ὀλυμπόνδε θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυροπέζα
Ἤιεν, ὄφρα φίλῳ παιδὶ κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἐνείκοι.
Τὴν μὲν ἄρ' Ὀλυμπόνδε πόδες φέρον· αὐταὶ Ἀχαιοὶ
Θεσπεσίῳ ἀλαλητῷ ὑφ' Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
Φευγόντες, νηάς τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἱκόντο.
Οὐδέ κε Πάτροκλον περ ἰῦκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
Ἐκ βελέων ῥύσαντο νέκυν, θεράποντ' Ἀχιλῆος·
Αὖτις γὰρ δὴ τόν γε κίχον λαός τε καὶ ἵπποι,
Ἕκτωρ τε Πριάμοιο πάϊς, φλογὶ εἴκελος ἀλκήν.
Τρὶς μέν μιν μετόπισθε ποδῶν λάβε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
Ἑλκεμέναι μεμαώς, μέγα δὲ Τρώεσσιν ὁμόκλα·
Τρὶς δὲ δύ' Αἰάντες, θάρσει πεπιθημένοι ἀλκῇ,
Νεκρὸν ἀπεςυφέλιξαν· ὁ δ' ἔμπεδον ἀλκὶ πεποιθὼς,
Ἄλλοτ' ἐπαΐξασκε καθοὶ μόθον, ἄλλοτε αὖτε
Στάσκε μέγα ἰάχων· ὀπίσω δ' ὑ χάζετο παμπαν.
Ὡς δ' ἀπὸ σώματος ὔτι λέοντ' αἴθωνα δυνάνται

Ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι μέγα πεινάοντα διέσθαι
Ὣς ῥα τὸν οὐκ ἐδύναντο δύω Αἴαντε κορυςὰ
Ἕκτορα Πριαμίδην ἀπὸ νεκρῦ δειδίξασθαι.
Καί νύ κεν εἴρυσσέν τε, καὶ ἄσπετον ἤρατο κῦδος,
Εἰ μὴ Πηλείωνι ποδήνεμος ὠκέα Ἶρις
Ἄγγελος ἦλθε θέουσ' ἀπ' Ολύμπου θωρήσσεσθαι,
Κρύβδα Διὸς, ἄλλων τε θεῶν· πρὸ γὰρ ἧκέ μιν Ἥρη·
Ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱςαμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα
Ὄρσεο, Πηλείδη, πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν·
Πατρόκλῳ ἐπάμυνον, οὗ εἵνεκα φύλοπις αἰνὴ
Ἕςηκε πρὸ νεῶν· οἱ δ' ἀλλήλους ὀλέκουσιν,
Οἱ μὲν ἀμυνόμενοι νέκυος περὶ τεθνειῶτος,
Οἱ δὲ ἐρύσσασθαι ποτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν
Τρῶες ἐπιθύουσι· μάλιςα δὲ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
Ελκέμεναι μέμονεν· κεφαλὴν δέ ἑ θυμὸς ἀνώγει
Πῆξαι ἀνὰ σκολόπεσσι, ταμόνθ' ἁπαλῆς ἀπὸ δειρῆς.

Ποιμένες ἀγραύλοι μέγα πεινάοντα διέσθαι.
Ὣς ῥα τὸν ὀκ ἐδύναντο δύω Αἴαντε κορυςὰ
Ἕκτορα Πριαμίδην ἀπὸ νεκρῦ δειδιξάσθαι.
Καί νύ κεν εἴρυσσέν τε, ϗ ἄσπετον ᾔρατο κύδος,
Εἰ μὴ Πηλείωνι ποδήνεμος ὠκέα Ἶρις
Ἄγγελος ἦλθε θέοσ' ἀπ' Ολύμπου θωρησσέσθαι,
Κρύβδα Διὸς, ἄλλων τε θεῶν· πρὸ γὰρ ἧκέ μιν Ἥρη·
Αγχῦ δ' ἱςαμένη ἐπέα πτερόεντα προσηύδα.
Ὄρσεο, Πηλείδη, πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν·
Πατρόκλῳ ἐπάμυνον, ὕ εἵνεκα φύλοπις αἰνὴ
Ἑςήκε πρὸ νεῶν, οἱ δ' ἀλλήλους ὀλεκούσιν,
Οἱ μὲν ἀμυνομένοι νεκύος περὶ τεθνειώτος,
Οἱ δὲ ἐρυσσάσθαι ποτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμοέσσαν
Τρῶες ἐπιθύουσι· μάλιςα δὲ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
Ελκεμέναι μεμόνεν· κεφαλὴν δέ ἑ θυμὸς ἀνώγει
Πῆξαι ἀνὰ σκολόπεσσι, ταμὸνθ' ἁπαλῆς ἀπὸ δειρῆς.

It is perhaps to be expected, that, upon the firſt trial of our method, many, who have been habituated, as all, indeed, in this country, are habituated, in the practice of reading Greek verſe by the rules of the Latin accents; will be diſpleaſed with the frequent alteration for the worſe, as they will think it, which our principles produce; when, in conſequence of length accruing to the final ſyllable, they require, that the acute accent of a proparoxyton, in ſuch connection, ſhould be ſounded upon the penult, though the penult be a ſhort ſyllable: when the natural accent of the ſolitary word agrees with the Latin method. This many will, at firſt, think a change for the worſe, in the recitation of Greek poetry; and will conſider it, as an objection to our principles. We have only to reply; that it is a change, which ariſes out of a ſtrict conformity to the fundamental rules of the Greek accents, rightly underſtood. That it is a change, which thoſe rules indiſpenſibly demand. And it ſeems to be but a ſlight objection, that a compliance with theſe rules, in an inſtance, in which, through mere inattention, they have hitherto been diſregarded, multiplies the inſtances, in which

which the Greek accentuation deviates from the Latin rule. It may be ſo. But every language is beſt ſpoken, when it is ſpoken by its own rules. We inſiſt, that the accentuation of the ſhort penult affects not the brevity of the ſyllable, if the true power of the vowel be preſerved. And we ſcruple not to aſſert, that the rhythm of the verſe, far from being injured, is always improved by it. This, indeed, is a matter, upon which the ear muſt ultimately decide. But it may be an inducement to the learned reader to conſult his own ear upon the queſtion, to ſuggeſt to his attention this fact. *That, in the very beſt and moſt melodious of Homer's verſes, the Dactyls, in nineteen inſtances out of twenty, or perhaps in a much larger proportion, carry an acute accent upon the laſt ſyllable.* This happens ſo frequently, that it muſt have been matter, not of chance, but of the poet's choice.

Upon the whole, although a new pronunciation will not be acquired without difficulty; and, till it becomes eaſy and familiar, will appear in ſome degree uncouth; we are nevertheleſs perſuaded, that any one, who will be at the trouble to get the habit

of

of giving the ſeveral vowels and diphthongs with their proper powers, conſtantly preſerving the diſtinction between long and ſhort, will find, in the recitation of the Greek heroic verſe, and of the Iambics and Anapæſtics of the tragedians, by accent, according to the rules we have laid down, a rhythm and a melody, and a variety of the rhythm and of the melody, which he never perceived before, and far more exquiſite, to a critical ear, than any thing the beſt Latin verſe affords.

APPEN-

APPENDIX.

IT is neceſſary to appriſe the learned reader, that the foregoing treatiſe was finiſhed, in the greater part, before the author of it became acquainted with the *Accentus Redivivi* of Mr. William Primatt, or knew, indeed, of the exiſtence of the book; which was printed, at Cambridge, in the year 1764. It is a work of much labour, and conſiderable talents; in which, however, a critical knowledge of the hiſtory of accents is united with a moſt erroneous theory of the effect of them in pronunciation. As the principles, upon which the ſcheme, which we now offer to the learned world, for the reſtoration of the Greek pronunciation, ſtands; are diametrically oppoſite to the opinions advanced,

vanced, upon that branch of the ſubject, by ſo learned a writer; though our hiſtorical argument is confirmed by him in every point; it is a reſpect due to his abilities and erudition, not to paſs unnoticed the arguments, by which he has endeavoured to ſupport principles, ſo contradictory to thoſe which we maintain.

Mr. Primatt, though he maintains the antiquity of the accents, and defends the accented pronunciation of Greek proſe, agrees with the oppoſers of the Greek accents, that they are not calculated to regulate the recitation of verſe; being deſtructive, as he ſuppoſes, of metrical quantity. He is reduced, therefore, to the neceſſity of ſuppoſing, that verſe and proſe were pronounced, by the antient Greeks, by two different rules: the one, by the rule of the Latin accent; which he, with the generality of thoſe who diſuſe the Greek accents, conſiders as an univerſal rule of quantity, or metrical recitation; (which we have ſhewn to be a groſs miſtake,) the other, by the proper accents of the Greek language. He is reduced to the neceſſity of this improbable concluſion, by falling in with the common prejudice about the acute accent, that it lengthens the time

of

of the ſyllable on which it falls.—" It is the " nature of a tone," he ſays (meaning an acute accent), " to extend the voice, or give " quantity." (P. 63.) Again, p. 70, he mentions it as " one of the extraordinary " powers of the acute accent, even to change " the real quantity." And he ſpeaks of the opinion of Adolphus Meckerchus, and the Meſſieurs de Port Royal, that the accent only " raiſes the voice, but gives no dura- " tion in pronouncing, as falſe." And, p. 73, he quotes, with entire approbation, the words of a writer againſt accents, who ſays, that " No elevation of the voice (ſuch as " accents are ſuppoſed to denote) can ſubſiſt, " and be made ſenſible in pronouncing, " whatever may be done otherwiſe in ſing- " ing, without ſome ſtreſs or pauſe, which " is always able to make a ſhort ſyllable " long."

It is very extraordinary, that this acute and learned writer, maintaining, as he does, that it is a power, inherent in the very nature of the acute tone, to lengthen the quantity of the ſyllable on which it falls; ſhould admit that, in muſic, length of ſound and acuteneſs of tone are not always united. For it might be expected, that a power,

inherent in the nature of the thing, ſhould produce its effect, wherever the thing itſelf is found. But the admiſſion, which Mr. Primatt makes of a difference, in this matter, between muſic and ſpeech, is not more extraordinary, than the manner, in which he attempts to account for it.

" Though muſic and diſcourſe," he ſays, " fall under the common genus of ſinging, " yet, in the firſt, the motion is, as Euclid " calls it, diaſtematic, or diſtinguiſhed by " intervals; in the ſecond, continued. Now, " where the motion is by intervals, as in " muſic, every note is *ad libitum*, both as to " the elevation and depreſſion of it; as to " the number of times, the elevated or de- " preſſed note ſhall be repeated; as to the " meaſurement of it, whether it ſhall be " held a longer or a ſhorter time; and, laſtly, " as to the ſtreſs that ſhall be laid upon it. " But, in continued motion, as in diſcourſe, " which is compoſed of many ſyllables and " words, as a tune is of many notes; you " cannot depreſs or elevate the voice, as " often, and whereſoever you pleaſe. There " muſt be an elevation upon every word, " (enclitics excepted), and no more than " one elevation on any one word," [upon the

the Greek oxytons, in connection, there was no elevation; upon words preceding enclitics, very often two]; "and that on "the ſyllable, which bears the acute accent; "which, for that reaſon, however the "quantity may require it, cannot glide on "ſo very nimbly, as the objection ſeems to "think it may: for, a greater ſtreſs is to be "laid on that ſyllable, than on any other "of the word." (p. 74-5.)

It might be a ſufficient confutation of theſe notions of this learned writer, about the effect of accent, to obſerve, that the account, which he here gives, of the difference between ſinging and ſpeaking, with which his whole theory of accents muſt ſtand or fall, is neither more nor leſs, than the unanimous doctrine of the antient writers upon harmony reverſed. Aſk Ariſtoxenus, aſk Euclid, aſk Ariſtides, aſk Nicomachus, aſk Gaudentius, in what the difference conſiſts between ſpeaking and ſinging; they tell you, with one conſent, that there are "two "ſpecies of local motion belonging to the "voice." (By the local motion of the voice, or ſound, they mean the tranſition from high to low, or the contrary.) "That the one "is a continuous motion; the other diaſte-

"matic.

" matic. That the continuous is the motion " of the voice in diſcourſe; the diaſtematic, " in ſinging." And ſo far Mr. Primatt's doctrine is correct. But aſk theſe writers again, what is continuous motion, and what is diaſtematic; you will find, that, with one conſent, they deſcribe the continuous motion by thoſe properties, which Mr. Primatt aſcribes to the diaſtematic; and the diaſtematic they deſcribe, by thoſe properties, which he aſcribes to the continuous.

" According to the continuous motion," ſaith Ariſtoxenus, " the voice ſeems to ſenſe " to paſs through a certain place, in ſuch " manner, as to ſtop no where, not even at " the extremities, as far as the ſenſe can " perceive; but it ſeems to go on, without " any interruption of its motion, till it " comes to abſolute ſilence. But, according " to the other ſpecies of motion, to which " we give the name of diaſtematic, it ſeems " to be moved in a contrary manner. For, " ſtepping over [a certain ſpace], it ſtops " itſelf, firſt upon one note, then upon " another. And when it thus ſtops upon " the exact notes, and ſounds them preciſely, " and each diſtinctly by itſelf, it is ſaid to " ſing, and to be moved, according to the

" diaſtematic

'diaſtematic motion.—Now, we ſay, that "the continuous motion is the motion of "common ſpeech. For whenever we talk, "the voice is ſo moved from place to place, "as nowhere to ſeem to ſtand. But in the "other ſpecies of motion, which we call the "diaſtematic, the voice appears to be kept at "a ſtand; and all agree, that a perſon who "appears to do this, no longer ſpeaks, but "ſings. For, in ſpeaking, we avoid any "ſtopping of the motion of the voice upon "any particular tone; unleſs we are obliged "to take up this ſpecies of motion, in order "to expreſs ſome particular paſſion. In "ſinging we do the contrary; for we avoid "continuity of motion, and make it a point, "as much as poſſible, to arreſt the voice; "for the more we make each ſound one, "ſteady, and invariable, the more accurate "our execution will ſeem to the ear *."

By the ſtopping of the voice, it is evident, Ariſtoxenus means its dwelling upon the ſound of each note diſtinctly. Euclid, Nicomachus, and Gaudentius, deliver the ſame doctrine, in very ſimilar expreſſions. According to theſe writers, the very eſſence and form of ſinging conſiſts in a certain

* Ariſtoxenus apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 8-9.

commorance of the voice upon each diſtinct note: and the eſſence and form of common ſpeech conſiſts in the negation of that commorance. But according to Mr. Primatt, this commorance of the voice, upon the acute accent, is neceſſary in common ſpeech, and is not at all neceſſary in ſinging. Deny this, which we are authoriſed by the antients to deny, and his whole theory of the effect of accent upon quantity falls to the ground.

To obviate a miſconception of this doctrine of the antient writers, concerning the continuous and diaſtematic motions of the voice, it is carefully to be obſerved, that, when they ſpeak of a commorance of the voice upon the diſtinct notes, as eſſential to the diaſtematic movement; and the negation of that commorance, as eſſential to the continuous movement in common ſpeech; they are to be underſtood of a commorance, or no commorance, upon the note; not upon the ſyllable. Their doctrine, applied to the ſyllable, would overturn the whole notion of quantity, or time. For were there no dwelling of the voice, in ſpeech, upon the ſound of one ſyllable, more than of another; there could be no long ſyllable, and no inequality in the times of ſhort ones. But,

the

the time of the ſyllable, and the time of the note upon the ſyllable, are two diſtinct things. The time or quantity of the ſyllable is fixed in the nature of things. It depends upon the power of the vowel, or is the effect of the conſonants, with which the vowel is connected: and it cannot be lengthened, or abridged, if the vowel be given with its true power, and the conſonants with their juſt effect. But the time of the note, within certain limits, is arbitrary; and depends upon the management of the voice, or of the inſtrument. The time of the ſyllable may be ſhorter than that of the note; as is the caſe in muſic, when the ſame note is ſuſtained upon ſeveral ſyllables in ſucceſſion: or the time of the ſyllable may exceed that of the note; as in the caſe in ſpeech, in every circumflexed ſyllable. There is nothing, therefore, in this doctrine of the writers upon harmony, inconſiſtent with the grammatical doctrine of metrical quantity. We return to Mr. Primatt.

He endeavours to ſupport his notion of the effect of accent, by authorities of the antient grammarians. The only authority,

which is indeed to his purpoſe, is that of a ſcholiaſt upon Hephæſtion.

In the twelfth book of the Iliad there is a line, very famous for the trouble it gave the critics of antiquity, which has, as it ſhould ſeem, a pyrrich in the place of the final ſpondee:

Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν ὅπως ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν.

That this ſingular formation of the verſe was not accidental, but a matter of the poet's choice, is evident; becauſe it had eaſily been avoided, by a different, and more melodious, arrangement of the very ſame words:

Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν ὅπως ὄφιν αἰόλον εἶδον.

Hence ſome concluded, that the poet meant, by this diſordered ſtate of the metre, to expreſs the conſternation and diſorder of the mind, which the prodigy produced in the ſpectators. Others fancied, that the ſmall ending of the verſe alluded to the ſlender ſhape of the ſerpent's tail. Others ſaid, and this was probably the true ſolution of the difficulty, that the word was ſometimes pronounced, and ſhould be written in this place, ὄπφιν; which makes the word a troch, the firſt ſyllable being lengthened by the double

double conſonant. And a troch, it is well known, in the ſixth place of an hexameter, is equivalent to a ſpondee; the laſt ſyllable being lengthened by its poſition. The critics, who propoſed this way of writing the word, cited a line of Heſiod, in which the word σκύφον, for the ſake of the quantity, was written σκύπφον; and a line of Anacreon, where the ſame orthography of the ſame word is uſed. But a Scholiaſt upon Hephæſtion cuts the knot with leſs ceremony. He ſays that "the acute accent lengthens the ο." Had this been the true ſolution of the difficulty; it is not likely, that any other would have been attempted. Had this ſuppoſed power of the acute accent been real, it muſt have been generally known; and the great critics of antiquity would never have gone to look for the reaſon of what, according to the common orthography and pronunciation, they deemed a violation of the rules of heroic verſe, in the fright of the Trojans, or the ſhape of the ſerpent's tail. And it is a ſufficient proof, that this notion of Hephæſtion's ſcholiaſt is without any foundation, that he is the only grammarian, who applies this ſuppoſed power of the acute accent to the ſolution of a difficulty, which per-

plexed the moſt learned critics. But he adds, in perfect agreement with Mr. Primatt: "The acute accent has ſuch a nature "and power, as not only to lengthen a "ſhort ſyllable, when it is placed over it; "but, being ſet before or after a ſhort ſyl- "lable, it has the power of lending time to "it."

Now this aſſertion, concerning the power of the acute accent upon the circumambient ſyllables, though not accurately true, is not without ſome foundation; or rather, the error is not without excuſe, in a relation, which really obtains, in ſpeech, between accent and quantity, tone and time. Which is ſuch, that, although accent is, in no inſtance, the cauſe of quantity; yet, in words of many ſyllables, the general ſound of the word will be more or leſs agreeable to the ear, according as ſyllables, at certain diſtances from the ſeat of the acute accent, are long or ſhort in time. Hence, if accent were placed, without any regard to quantity, it would often ſeduce the ſpeaker into a violation of quantity, for the ſake of the general euphony of the word. Thus, if the word εὐλομένην is pronounced with the Latin accent upon the antepenult, the ſpeaker will be

be very apt, as was before remarked, to ſhorten both the initial and the final ſyllables, ᾰ-, and ῐν. That this is no *neceſſary* effect of the accent upon the antepenult, appears from the example of the Latin language. If the diphthong ει, and the vowel η, be given, each with its proper power, the ſyllables will be long, in ſpight of accent; but the ſound of the whole word will be leſs pleaſing. And from this circumſtance, the ſpeaker, governed by mere euphony, will be very apt to violate the true powers of the vowels. On the contrary, let the accent, in the ſame word, be given, by the Greek rule, upon the penult; and the ſpeaker, without deſign almoſt, and led by his ear, will give both the firſt and final ſyllable, with its proper length of ſound. For were he to pronounce either of them ſhort, the general ſound of the whole word would be indiſtinct, and diſpleaſing. Accent, therefore, abuſively may be ſaid to influence quantity; as a certain collocation of the acute accent will lead, even an inattentive ſpeaker, to a correct, and another collocation of it betray any, but the moſt attentive, into a vicious, pronunciation.

It is the end of all the fundamental rules of accentuation, in the Greek language, to ſecure this good effect of accent, and to obviate the ill effect of a leſs critical arrangement: the ſeat of the acute accent, determined by theſe rules, being always that, which renders the prolation of every ſyllable of the word, in its juſt quantity, a matter of the greateſt poſſible eaſe to the ſpeaker. Theſe rules proceed, not from the accent to the quantity, but in the contrary order. They aſſume the quantity as given, as indeed it always is, independent of accent; and then aſſign the place, which, regard being had to the quantity of ſyllables in certain parts of the word, the accent ought to take. Thus accent is, in many inſtances, a ſymptom of quantity; in none, a cauſe of it. This relation between quantity and accent, ill underſtood, led Hephæſtion's Scholiaſt, and Mr. Primatt after him, to the erroneous notion, that accent might influence quantity, as a cauſe of it; or might create quantity. Were this the truth, accent would make a neceſſary part of the doctrine of metrical quantity. And it would have been impoſſible, that a writer like Hephæſtion, profeſſing to treat the ſcience of quantity,

and to deliver its firſt principles, ſhould take no notice of accent. And yet, this is the caſe. Accent is not once mentioned in Hephæſtion's whole work. Indeed accents being only ſymptoms of quantity, being ſymptoms only according to rules, in great meaſure arbitrary; and quantity being, with more preciſion, expreſſed by its own marks; a writer upon quantity has little concern with accents. The whole theory of quantity may be delivered, as it is by Hephæſtion, without any conſideration of accents. But were accents, in any way, the efficient, or the formal cauſe of quantity; it would be no leſs impoſſible, to explain the principles of quantity, without the mention of accent, than without the mention of nature, poſition, and uſe. Hephæſtion's ſilence, therefore, about accents, is an ample confutation of his Scholiaſt's notion.

The notion being thus confuted, it is of little importance to enquire, who the Scholiaſt may have been. Mr. Primatt, to add weight to his authority, is willing to ſuppoſe, that Longinus was this Scholiaſt. Longinus certainly wrote notes upon the Enchiridion of Hephæſtion. But it is by no means a ſafe concluſion, that every thing, which occurs

occurs in the Scholia upon Hephæſtion, as we now have them, is to be aſcribed to Longinus. The Scholia, upon moſt authors, are collections of the remarks of various critics, of different ages, and very unequal talents. And the Scholia upon Hephæſtion may be ſuch a compilation, conſiſting of the notes of Longinus, mixed with thoſe of other grammarians of a later age, and an inferior form.

Mr. Primatt imagines, that he has the authority of Quinctilian, in addition to that of this Scholiaſt upon Hephæſtion, to prove, that the effect of the change of the place of the tone is to change the quantity. That this was the caſe in the judgement of Quinctilian, is too evident, he ſays, (p. 223), to be denied, by any one, who has duly conſidered the following paſſage:

—"*Pecudes, pictæque volucres.*"

"*Volúcres mediâ acutâ legam,*" ſays Quinctilian, "I muſt read *volucres* with the middle "ſyllable acute." *He muſt.*—But by what compulſion muſt he? By no other than the arbitrary rule of Latin accent; which requires an acute accent upon the penult, when

whenever it is long. There is no compulſion in the nature of the thing. For the middle ſyllable would be long, if the *u* were given with its long power, though the acute accent kept its place.

In addition to the authority of Hephæſtion's Scholiaſt, and the ſuppoſed authority of Quinctilian, Mr. Primatt has little to produce, but ſome ſcraps of different authors, for the moſt part miſunderſtood and miſinterpreted, and ſometimes injudiciouſly tacked together, without any critical attention to the ſenſe of each ſeparately, or any diſcrimination of the ſubjects, of which the authors ſeverally treat.

Firſt, we have a ſcrap from Porphyry, (p. 71.) and another, to the ſame purpoſe, and in the ſame words, from Moſcophylus Byzantinus, (p. 405.)—ὅτε χρόνος χωρὶς τόνου εὑρίσκεται, ὅτε τόνος χωρὶς χρόνου. But this only means, that tone and time are both neceſſary adjuncts of articulate ſound; and it will be very difficult to deduce, from this maxim, Mr. Primatt's doctrine, that length of time muſt always follow height of tone.

The next is a ſcrap from Dionyſius Thrax, which Mr. Primatt calls a definition of tone.

Τόνος

Τόνος πρὸς ον ἄδομεν, ϗ τὴν φωνὴν εὐρυτέραν ποιεῖμεν. It is indeed a definition of tone. But not of tone in the grammatical, or popular, ſenſe of the word, in which Mr. Primatt underſtands it, but of tone, in that peculiar technical ſenſe, in which it is uſed by the writers upon harmony, when they write with mathematical preciſion. Tone is uſed by theſe writers, as Euclid himſelf informs us*, in four different ſenſes. It is ſometimes uſed in its popular or grammatical ſenſe, for a note, or accent. Sometimes in a ſenſe, ſtill more general and popular, for ſound in general. Sometimes, as equivalent to διάςημα, in the ſenſe of interval. But its peculiar ſenſe, as a technical term of the ſcience of harmony, was to ſignify, what Euclid calls "the place "of the voice;" that is to ſay, the general key of the tune. In which ſenſe they ſpoke of the Lydian tone, the Dorian, and the Phrygian. Tone, in this technical ſenſe of the word, ſeems to be the ſubject of Dionyſius's definition, which has nothing at all to do with accent, or individual notes. Dionyſius's ſentence is elliptical, and ſhould be thus ſupplied.—Τόνος πρὸς ον ἄδομεν, ϗ [πρὸς ὅν] τὴν φωνὴν εὐρυτέραν ποιεῖμεν. "Tone, or the key, is

* Euclid. apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 19.

"that,

" that, according to which we ſing; and " with reference to which we give more or " leſs of breadth to the voice." *i. e.* we raiſe the voice higher, or ſink it lower. By the breadth of ſound, the antient writers upon muſic expreſſed, what we now expreſs by the two words, *height* and *depth*. And the height and depth of every note is eſtimated in relation to the general key of the ſyſtem. Euclid's definition of tone is equivalent to this. —Τόνος δέ ἐςι τόπος τις τῆς φωνῆς δεκτικὸς συςήμαλος, ἀπλαλής. " Tone is a certain place of the " voice, capacious of ſyſtem, without " breadth." *Without breadth.* This is not contrary to Dionyſius's definition. The key itſelf, being one unvaried note, a monotony, is without breadth; but it is with relation to this, that the breadth, occaſionally given to the ſound, is eſtimated. This word, ἀπλατής, is introduced by Euclid, in his definition of the key, with reference to a matter in diſpute, between the earlier and the later muſicians. Some of the firſt writers upon the ſubject had affirmed, that breadth was a natural property of ſound; inſomuch that no ſound could be abſolutely without it. If the aſſertion only meant, that ſound in ſuch ſort partakes of that conſtant change and flow,

flow, which is inſeparable from all material things, that no individual note could be ſuſtained, for any length of time however ſmall, abſolutely unaltered; it was true: but it was a truth of little importance, either to the ſcience or the art of muſic. The Pythagoreans, and with them Ariſtoxenus, Euclid, and their followers, underſtanding the propoſition, as it ſhould ſeem, of a change of tone ſenſible to the ear; which is the only breadth of ſound, with which the muſician is concerned, denied it. They conſidered, that it was ſufficient to all practical purpoſes, if the ſound could be maintained at a given pitch, without any ſenſible riſe or fall; and they chooſe to adjuſt the technical language of an art, converſant only with ſenſible objects, to ſenſe, rather than to the abſtract truth of things. They denied, therefore, that breadth, meaning a ſenſible breadth, was a natural property of ſound; giving themſelves no concern, as muſicians, whatever philoſophers might do, about a breadth, which the ear could not diſtinguiſh. Both ſides underſtood by breadth the ſame thing; namely, a riſe or fall of the ſound, above or below any given note; both agreed, that breadth might be given to ſound; without which,

which, indeed, there could be nothing but monotony; and both took a certain key as the level, in relation to which, the breadth was to be eſtimated. The only effect of the epithet ἁπλατὴς joined to τόπος, in Euclid's definition of τόνος, is to remind the reader that the place of the voice is to be conſidered as a meer line, without breadth. This definition, and that of Dionyſius, are in effect the ſame, and neither the one nor the other at all to Mr. Primatt's purpoſe, ſince neither is a definition of τόνος in the ſenſe of accent.

It is true, that Dionyſius Thrax, as appears by the extracts of his inedited work, given by the learned Rod. Wetſtein, in his Appendix to his Diſſertation upon the Greek Accents, from which Mr. Primatt has borrowed this quotation, ſpeaks of *ſinging* Homer's poems; and ſays, that "they were "ſung to the accents*." It is certain, that this *ſinging* is not to be underſtood of ſinging, properly ſo called; for which the accents could not be a ſufficient direction; but only of a certain modulated recitation, differing from ſong, as Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis obſerves, in degree only, not in kind; which

* —πρὸς αὐτὰς ᾄδεσθαι τὰ Ὁμήρου ποιήματα.

differed,

differed, however, from the recitation of proſe. And the difference lay principally in this circumſtance, that the accents were more nicely regarded, and the diſtinction between acute and grave more accurately, and more forcibly, marked by the voice. This, however, may create a doubt, whether the paſſage, we have been conſidering, is a definition of muſical tone, properly ſo called, or of this reciting tone. Admitting the latter to be the caſe, which is very probable, ſtill it is a definition of this reciting tone, as belonging to the ſpecies of muſical tone, differing from it only in the degree of more or leſs; and, therefore, falling under the ſame general definition. It will indeed be the general definition of tone, applied to the inſtance of the grammatical tones. And the general ſenſe of the terms will ſtill be the ſame, and quite foreign to Mr. Primatt's purpoſe. The breadth of the ſound will ſtill ſignify the deviation of the voice, riſing or falling, whether in this chaunt of poetry, or in perfect ſong, from a given key, or pitch. And the expreſſion will ſtill have no relation to the quantity, to the length, or brevity, of ſyllables. It will be neceſſary, indeed, to correct our tranſlation of the

latter

latter clauſe—καὶ [πρὸς ὃν] τὴν φωνὴν εὐρυτέραν ποιοῦμεν. "And [with reſpect to which] we "make the ſound of the voice broader," or we give the ſound more breadth, [than we do in common ſpeaking] i. e. we mark the elevations more ſtrongly. It is to be obſerved, by the way, that in theſe extracts from Dionyſius Thrax, we have the poſitive teſtimony of that antient grammarian, that Homer's verſe was read by the accents. For what elſe can he mean, when he ſays "Ho. "mer's poems were chaunted to the "accents?"

Mr. Primatt has another authority; which is made up of a ſcrap of Herodian the grammarian, which he conſiders in connection with a ſcrap of Hermogenes the rhetor; though the two paſſages have no relation to one another, except that the word, τάσις, happens to be uſed in both, but in very different ſenſes; as might well be ſuppoſed of a word uſed by different writers treating very different ſubjects. Herodian propoſes the queſtion, why the imperatives of the ſecond aoriſt active εἰπέ, ἐλθέ, and εὑρέ, are oxytoniſed, contrary to the general rule, which barytoniſes the imperatives in this

tenſe. He anſwers, becauſe in other verbs the penultimate of the ſecond aoriſt is ſhort, but the penultimate of theſe is long. Ὡς ἓν διήλλαξαν κατὰ τὴν παραλήγουσαν, διήλλαξαν καὶ περὶ τὴν τάσιν. "Inaſmuch, therefore, as they made "a change in the penultimate, they made a "change alſo in the tone of the word;" namely, by making it an oxyton, inſtead of a baryton. For tone is the ſenſe of τάσις here. Mr. Primatt renders it "accent," which is the ſame thing. But he adds, "that what "the property of the accent is, as conveyed "to us under the word τάσις, Hermogenes the "rhetorician will inform us." (p. 76.) And then he produces a paſſage of Hermogenes, in which we find, indeed, the word τάσις, but nothing at all about accent. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τάσις, τὸ ἀποβλάσθαι ἐπὶ μακρότερον ἢ χρὴ τὸ πνεῦμα. The entire paſſage of Hermogenes, of which this is but a ſhred, occurs in his fourth book, Of Oratorical Invention, and is to this effect: Τάσις δὲ ἐστὶ λόγου, ὅταν ὑπεραίρῃ τῷ μέτρῳ τοῦ λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα, μακρότερον γινόμενον τοῦ δύνασθαι ἐν ἰδίῳ ληφθῆναι τοῦ λέγοντος πνεύματι· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τάσις, τὸ ἀποβλάσθαι ἐπὶ μακρότερον ἢ χρὴ τὸ πνεῦμα*.

* Hermogines Sturmii, Tom. II. p. 194.

The

The word, τάσις, is uſed by Hermogenes as a technical term of rhetoric, with reference to the word πνεῦμα, another technical term of rhetoric. This paſſage is a definition of the term τάσις. And this definition will be better underſtood, if we go back to a former definition of the word πνεῦμα*. By this it appears, that πνεῦμα (which might be rendered a wind) was uſed by Hermogenes to denote a certain length of period, ſo proportioned to the natural powers of the ſpeaker's voice, that, with the pauſes which the ſubdiviſions into branches and clauſes would afford, the ſpeaker might deliver the whole without running himſelf *out of wind.* From this account of πνεῦμα, it is eaſy to underſtand the diſtinction, in this definition of τάσις, between the πνεῦμα λόγυ, the wind of the ſpeech, and ἴδιον πνεῦμα τῦ λέγονϛος, the ſpeaker's own wind; and the whole definition is very perſpicuous. The length of period, which was juſt within the compaſs of the ſpeaker's breath, being called πνεῦμα, or a wind, what was more than this was naturally enough called τάσις, or a ſtretch. This is the ſenſe of τάσις, as it is uſed by Hermogenes; a ſenſe, which has no connec-

* Hermogenes Sturmii, Tom. II. p. 178.

tion with accent. The definition of the word, in this ſenſe, can throw no light upon the paſſage adduced from Herodian, or upon any paſſage of any writer, where "accent" is the ſubject.

Theſe, of all Mr. Primatt's authorities, are, in the firſt aſpect, the moſt impoſing. But, when critically examined, they amount to nothing. It were endleſs to enter into a particular conſideration of all the paſſages, which this learned writer has miſinterpreted, by an inaccuracy, which is indeed ſurprizing in a perſon ſo converſant in the ſubject; namely, by confounding the ſenſes of ἐπίτασις, ἄνεσις, ὀξύτης, βαρύτης, and τάσις. Theſe are five technical terms, with the writers upon harmony, carrying each its diſtinct and proper ſenſe. No one of them has the leaſt relation to the metrical time of ſyllables, in reference to which Mr. Primatt underſtands them all. For this ſeems to have been the ſource of all his falſe reaſoning upon the ſubject; that, when the properties of ſound are deſcribed by the antient writers in images taken from extenſion (and under ſuch images almoſt all its properties are deſcribed), Mr. Primatt's imagination always faſtened upon time, as the only ſubject of

that

that extenſion. Ἐπίτασις, intenſion, is the progreſſive motion of the voice, from a deeper to a higher note; and differs from ὀξύτης, height, or acuteneſs, as the cauſe from the effect: for, acuteneſs is the effect of intenſion. Ανεσις, remiſſion, is the progreſſive motion of the voice in the contrary direction, from a higher to a deeper note; and differs from βαρύτης, gravity, or depth, as the cauſe from the effect; for, gravity is the effect of remiſſion *. Τάσις, with the grammarians, is equivalent to τόνος, accent. With Hermogenes, it is a technical term of rhetoric. But with the writers upon muſic, τάσις, tenſion, is the dwelling of the voice upon any particular note (upon a *note*, obſerve, not upon a ſyllable); its ſtation, or commorance, in any given place once attained by intenſion or remiſſion †. And of this commorance of the voice Ariſtoxenus obſerves, in contradiction to Mr. Primatt, the high and the low notes are indifferently ſuſceptible. The definition of theſe terms will lead the learned reader to the true meaning of all thoſe paſſages, which Mr.

* Ariſtox. apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 10, 11. Confer. Euclid. p. 2.

† Ariſtox. ibid. p. 13. Euclid. p. 2.

Primatt has produced as authorities, for his extraordinary opinion, that height of tone and length of time are naturally connected, and will ſuperſede the neceſſity of any more particular confutation of that part of his argument.

There is, indeed, another word, ſtrangely underſtood by Mr. Primatt, which muſt not be paſſed entirely unnoticed. This is the word Ῥυθμός. It is rather extraordinary, that Mr. Primatt, diſſatisfied with the uſual expoſition of this word, inſtead of reſorting to the accurate definitions of Ariſtides Quinctilianus, ſhould attempt to fetch the true meaning of it from a ſhort obſcure fragment of Longinus; where, of all places, it is the leaſt likely to be found. For an accurate expoſition of the word, as a technical term of muſic, we refer to Ariſtides. It is uſed by grammarians, to ſignify ſomething leſs exact than metre: an orderly arrangement of quantity, which, without obſerving the ſtrict laws of verſification, produces a pleaſing effect upon the ear. Metre requires a regular return of certain feet, at certain intervals from each other; which neceſſarily produces verſe, or a diſtribution of ſpeech into ſimilar parts, either equal, or bearing

to

to each other a given proportion. Rhythm exacts no ſuch accuracy; but is ſatisfied with the general effect. In order to which it is neceſſary, indeed, that ſome regular proportion of time, but with much leſs exactneſs than in metre, ſhould be obſerved. Inſomuch that wherever iſochronous and homogeneous feet are predominant in a period, with ſome exactneſs at the beginning and the end, though with little nicety in the middle parts, there will be rhythm of a certain denomination. If given feet return in given places throughout, the rhythm takes the ſhape of metre of a certain denomination. Metre, therefore, is only rhythm of the moſt perfect kind: and nothing can be more abſurd, than Mr. Primatt's notion, that the rhythm of poetry may be contrary to the quantity, and break in upon it (157). This notion he builds upon no better foundation, than a fragment of Longinus, in which the author is evidently ſpeaking, not of the rhythm of ſpeech, but of the rhythm of ſounds in general *. And he ſays no more than Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus had ſaid before him, that muſical compoſition made free with the natural quantity of ſyllables.

* Fragmenta Longini, p. 111, Toup.

But, in confirmation of his argument from authorities, Mr Primatt ventures to appeal to the judgement of the ear. He produces the two words, πρωτότοκος, and πρωτοτόκος, the firſt rendering a *firſt-born*, the ſecond a *woman delivered of her firſt child*. And he makes this remark upon them —"I may "defy any body to vary the accent in theſe "two words, without affecting the quantity "at the ſame time." (p. 72.) The anſwer is, that we defy any one to affect the quantity at all, by a variation of the accent, ſo long as he preſerves the true quantity of the *o micron* in both ſyllables. If indeed you ſay πρωτοτώκος, giving the accented ο, in the penult, the power of the ω, which is the general way of ſpeaking among thoſe, who pretend to pronounce by accent, the penult will be made long; and ſo it would be, with this power of the ο, although the acute accent were laid upon the antepenult. Again, if you ſay πρωτώτοκος, the antepenult will be made long; and ſo it would be, when the long power of the ο is introduced, though the acute accent were laid upon the penult. But let the proper ſhort power of the *o micron* be preſerved in both places, and it will be perfectly indifferent to the quantity of the ſyl-

ſyllables, on which of the two the acute accent may be laid.

Had it not been for the erroneous notion, into which we have been ſeduced by our own vitious pronunciation, that accent and quantity, in the Greek language, were naturally at variance; men of learning would never have thought it a matter of taſte, and good judgement, to neglect the Greek accents, in the prolation of the Greek language. Much leſs would the notion have occurred to any advocate for the antiquity, and the uſe of accents, which Mr. Primatt is ſo anxious to maintain, that the Greeks had two different rules of pronunciation, one for proſe, and another for verſe; that "the one [verſe] was read according to "quantity, the other [proſe] by accent." (p. 128.) The learned reader will remember, that "this reading by quantity" is, in truth, a reading by the rules of the Latin accent. For as for that manner of reading by quantity, which Mechercus and Iſaac Voſſius endeavoured to introduce, which was rather a ſcanning of the verſe, than a reading of it, Mr. Primatt very juſtly ridicules, and condemns it. (p. 54 and 160.) But if this was

the

the fact, that the Greeks delivered their proſe by an accentuation of their own, and their verſe by the Latin accent, that is to ſay, by an arrangement of the accents, which the Latins afterwards adopted for the general rule of the tones of their language; for ſo the propoſition muſt be underſtood; the true ſtatement of the caſe will be this: not that they read either verſe or proſe without accent; but that they had two ſyſtems of accentuation, one for proſe, and another for verſe. And if this was really the caſe, it is a very extraordinary fact, but a fact it moſt certainly is, that the grammarians, who have written ſuch elaborate commentaries upon the poets, and in thoſe commentaries have written ſo much about that ſyſtem of accentuation, with which their authors were not at all concerned, the proſaic ſyſtem; have all of them maintained the moſt profound ſilence concerning the other ſyſtem of accentuation, the rules of which alone their authors muſt have followed. Extraordinary as this fact muſt ſeem, Mr. Primatt is confident in the aſſertion, "that verſe and "proſe were read differently, the one accor- "ding to quantity, the other by accent." And he is confident, too, that he has diſ-

covered

covered a direct proof of this aſſertion, in what Ariſtotle has ſaid of that ſpecies of ſophiſm, which turns upon the accent.

The diſtinction made by Ariſtotle between oral debate and writing, with regard to the more frequent opportunity which the latter affords of the accentual ſophiſm, has been explained at large in the foregoing treatiſe. But he makes another diſtinction, upon which, Mr. Primatt builds his proof of the aſſertion now under conſideration. Ariſtotle ſays, that the ambiguity, upon which this ſophiſm depends, occurs more frequently in poetry than in proſe. Mr. Primatt imagines, that this diſtinction muſt have ariſen from different rules of pronunciation in poetry and proſe; and thence concludes, that ſuch a difference actually obtained. (p. 128-136.)

In conſidering the diſtinction between words written, and words ſpoken; we ſhewed, that a ſuppoſition, made by Alexander Aphrodiſienſis, as the ground of it, was unneceſſary. We ſhall now ſhew, that the ſuppoſition, made by Mr. Primatt, as a ground of the diſtinction between poetry and proſe, is equally unneceſſary. The conſequence

will

will be, that Mr. Primatt's whole argument will fall to the ground.

Now the fact is, that the well-known peculiarities of the poetical language are a ſufficient ground for the diſtinction, without the aid of the precarious ſuppoſition of different rules of pronunciation in poetry and proſe. Becauſe theſe peculiarities neceſſarily produced the ambiguity of the accentual ſophiſm, in innumerable inſtances. Homer's language, from the high admiration, in which his writings were juſtly held, became a general model of language to all ſucceeding poets. Homer's language is an Æoliciſed Ionic*. From the Ionic it got many Atticiſms; and from the Æolic many Doriſms. For the relation of the Ionic to the Attic, and of the Æolic to the Doric, is well known, and univerſally allowed. Hence Homer's language has very much the appearance of a mixture of all the principal dialects, with certain modifications, which the exigencies of verſification introduced. And the lan-

* This was Bentley's opinion; as the author has learned from ſome ſhort MS. notes of Bentley's, lately communicated to him by a learned friend, who, for ſeveral years, has preſided, with much advantage to the riſing generation, and much credit to himſelf, in one of the firſt, and moſt juſtly famous, of the public ſeminaries of this kingdom.

guage

guage of the later poets was ſuch a mixture, ſo modified. Or in other words, the four dialects, the Attic, the Doric, the Ionic, and the Æolic, furniſhed, in common, the materials, out of which, poetry, by her own modifications, faſhioned a language of her own. Hence it has come to paſs, that poetry has many words of her own coining, which differ from common words of the proſaic language in nothing but the accent, though they bear a different meaning. Theſe words are the foundation of that greater facility of the accentual ſophiſm, which Ariſtotle remarks, in poetry than in proſe. For when theſe words occurred, a tranſcriber, or a repeater of verſe, would often miſtake them for common words of proſe. They would often be given, both in writing and ſpeech, with the accent that belonged to the common proſe word, and thus a falſe ſenſe would be ſuggeſted to the reader, or the hearer. And it is very manifeſt, that, under theſe circumſtances, a uniformity of accentuation in proſe and verſe, much more than a difference, would increaſe the frequency of the accentual ſophiſm.

That theſe peculiar words of the poetic language, without any thing of that different

rule

rule of pronunciation, which Mr. Primatt ſuppoſes, was the real ground of the difference with reſpect to the frequency of this ſophiſm in proſe and poetry, is evident, from Ariſtotle's example; which is that of a word of poetry, not otherwiſe diſtinguiſhed from a very common proſe word, than by the accent:

—διδομεν δὲ οἱ εὔχος ἀρέσθαι.

Theſe words, it ſeems, in Ariſtotle's time, made the latter part of the fifteenth line of the ſecond Iliad, where we now find

—Τρώεσσι δὲ κῆδε' ἐφῆπται.

They were the concluding words of Jupiter's charge to the miſchievous dream, the lying ſpirit, which he ſends to impoſe on Agamemnon. They were generally underſtood —"we grant to him to acquire glory." And the poet was cenſured, as by putting theſe words into the mouth of Jupiter, he implicated his Father of Gods and Men, immediately, and by his own proper agency, in the infamy of a lie. One Hippias of Thaſus, as we learn from Ariſtotle, brought him off*. The defence was, that the

* Vid. Ariſtot. De Sophiſt. Elench. Lib. I. c. 4. & De Poet. c. 25.

word, δίδομεν, was to be read, not δίδομεν, with the accent upon the antepenult, but διδόμεν, with the accent upon the penult. The word δίδομεν, accented upon the antepenult, is the firſt perſon plural, indic. præſ. act. of the verb δίδωμι. And this reading indeed makes the God a deceiver. But the word διδόμεν, accented upon the penult, is a poetic infinitive, præſ. act. of the verb δίδωμι, for διδόναι; for the Æolic infinitive of δίδωμι is διδόμεναι, which, by a poetic apocope of the final αι, becomes διδόμεν. And according to this reading, the words are a direction to the lying ſpirit of the dream. For by a figure very common with the poets, and indeed with other writers, the infinitive is often put for the imperative; as in the tenth line of this Iliad. Therefore

——δίδομεν δὲ οἱ εὖχος ἀρέσθαι .

would be—" we grant to him to acquire " glory." But

——διδόμεν δὲ οἱ εὖχος ἀρέσθαι

is—" offer to him the acquiſition of glory."

This difference of accentuation depends, not upon any different rules of pronunciation for proſe and poetry, but upon the different deduction of a word, in letters the ſame,

ſame, from the root. Δίδομεν, the firſt perſ. pl. præſ. indic. act. from δίδωμι, is a proparoxyton, becauſe δίδωμι itſelf is ſuch; and there is nothing in the inflexion to require a change in the ſeat of the accent. But the infinitive διδόναι is a paroxyton, by virtue of a general rule concerning infinitives ending in -ναι. The Æolic infinitive διδόμεναι is formed from διδόναι, by the inſertion of -με- between -ο- and -ν-. But the final diphthong -αι, being naturally ſhort, the accent keeps its place upon ο, though that vowel is thrown back, by the inſertion, to the place of the antepenult. And the poetic apocope again leaves the accent, where it finds it, upon ο. All this is according to the general rules of accentuation, not ariſing from any peculiar rule of pronunciation for verſe. Were the poetic δίδομεν ever uſed in proſe, it muſt be accented in the ſame manner. If there was any difference, between the pronunciation of the ſame words in proſe and verſe, it conſiſted only in that more exact conformity to the fundamental rules of accentuation, which verſe required, as it is exhibited in the ten maxims at the end of the foregoing treatiſe. This made the recitation of verſe, as it is deſcribed by Dionyſius Thrax, a ſort of ſinging;

or, as it is better deſcribed by Ariſtides Quinctilianus, a middle thing, between ſpeech and ſong. "The continuous motion of the "voice," he ſays, "is that, which makes "its intenſions and remiſſions imperceptibly, "by its velocity. The diaſtemic is that, "which has its tenſions manifeſt. The "middle is that, which partakes of both. "The continuous voice is that, in which "we diſcourſe. The middle is that, in "which we read poetry. And the diaſtematic "is that, which makes intervals, of certain "magnitudes, between ſimple ſounds*."

Notwithſtanding the erroneouſneſs of Mr. Primatt's theory of accents, and the fallacy of his arguments, upon that part of his ſubject, much information is to be derived from him upon the hiſtory, in which he appears to have been minutely, and critically, learned. Had his work fallen into our hands in time, we ſhould have referred to particular parts of it, where ſome of the arguments, that we have uſed for the antiquity of accents, are advanced by him to the ſame purpoſe. For though in fact we owe little to him, our work being finiſhed before we knew of the exiſtence of his, where he has pre-ocupied our autho-

* Ariſtides apud Muſicos Veteres Meibomii, p. 7.

rities, and our reaſoning, he has an undoubted right to be eſteemed the original. This is, in ſome degree, the caſe, upon the queſtion of the ſuppoſed relation between the grammatical accents, and the antient muſical ſcore; which latter, however, was much more perfect, than Mr. Primatt ſeems to have conceived. In the diſcuſſion of that paſſage of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis, which Upton makes an argument againſt the antiquity of the accents, which Mr. Primatt has conſidered critically, he has anticipated many of our remarks upon the accentuation of the words, in the air from the Oreſtes. To Mr. Primatt, alſo, we muſt aſcribe the diſcovery of Ariſtotle's authority for the antiquity of accents, in what he ſays of the accentual ſophiſm; though in the explanation of this paſſage, we differ totally from him, and deduce contrary concluſions.

Conceiving that Wetſtein's diſſertation upon the Greek accents, which was publiſhed at Baſle, in the year 1685, is become ſcarce, and is little known; we ſubjoin, for the ſatisfaction

tisfaction of the learned reader, all the extracts from Dionyſius Thrax, which he gives in his appendix. He procured them through the intereſt of his friend and patron, Magliabechi, the librarian of the duke of Tuſcany, from a MS. in the Medicean library.

1. Τί ἐϛι Προσῳδία;

Ποία τάσις ἐγγραμμάτῳ φωνῆς ὑγιοῦς* καλὰ τὸ ἀπαγγελτικὸν τῆς λέξεως ἐκφερομένης μετὰ τινὸς τῶν συνεζευγμένων περὶ μίαν συλλαβήν· ἤτοι κατὰ συνήθειαν διαλέκτῳ ὁμολογουμένης, [ἢ] κατὰ τὸν ἀναλογικὸν ὅρον καὶ λόγον.

2. Τόνος, πρὸς ὃν ᾄδομεν, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν εὐρυτέραν ποιοῦμεν.

3. Ἔϛι τόνος ἐπίτασις, ἢ ἄνεσις, ἢ μεσότης συλλαβῶν εὐφωνίαν ἔχουσα.

4. Πόθεν ἐτυμολογεῖται Προσῳδία;

Ἀπὸ τοῦ προσᾴδειν καὶ ἁρμόζειν τῇ ὑποκειμένῃ λέξει· ἢ ἀπὸ πρὸς αὐτὰς ᾄδεσθαι τὰ Ὁμήρου ποιήματα· ᾠδὰς γὰρ οἱ παλαιοὶ τὰ ποιήματα ἐκάλουν.

5. Πόσαι κυρίως προσῳδίαι;

* We would put a comma at φωνῆς, and another at ἐκφερομένης; and for ὑγιοῦς we would read ὑγιῶς.

Ἁπλᾶ· ἡ γὰρ ἀπόστροφος, καὶ ἡ ὑφὲν, καὶ ἡ διαστολὴ οὐκ εἰσὶ κυρίως προσῳδίαι, ἀλλὰ καταχρηστικῶς.

6. Πόσοι τόνοι;

Τρεῖς· ὀξὺς, βαρὺς, περισπώμενος.

Πόσοι κυρίως τόνοι;

Δύο· ἡ γὰρ βαρεῖα συλλαβικὸς τόνος ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐ κυρίως· διότι τόνος περιλείνει [mallem ἐπιλείνει] τὴν φωνήν.

7. Διὰ τί εἰσὶ τρεῖς τόνοι;

Διότι τρεῖς τρόποι εἰσὶ τῶν κινεῖσθαι ἑαυτὰς πρὸς δρόμον· ἢ γὰρ ὀρθῶς τις τρέχει, καὶ μιμεῖται τὴν ὀξεῖαν· ἢ κεκυφότως, καὶ μιμεῖται τὴν βαρεῖαν· ἢ ἡνιοχειτικῶς, καὶ μιμεῖται τὴν περισπωμένην.

8. Poſtea ſtatuit acutum accentum dici ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ὀξέων δοράτων, καὶ διὰ τὰς ὀξεῖς ἥλους μιμεῖσθαι: gravem nomen obtinuiſſe ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν τὰ φορτία βασταζόντων καὶ εὐθείαν τρίβον ἀνιόντων. Tandem circumflexum dici ἐκ τοῦ περικεκλᾶσθαι καὶ συναιρεῖσθαι, οἱονεὶ συνῃρημένη τις ἴσα καὶ περικεκλασμένη.

Wetſtein's diſſertation is a tract of conſiderable merit. It contains much uſeful in-

information, though not without ſome great miſtakes, upon the hiſtory of accents; and an able and elegant defence of the uſe of them: though the author ſeems inclined, in contradiction to the numerous and weighty authorities, which he himſelf produces, to adopt the ridiculous notion of Iſaac Voſſius, that the moſt antient manner of reading verſe was that, which is equivalent to a ſcanning of it.

The moſt important part of Wetſtein's diſſertation is his confutation of an opinion, generally received, that the accents are not found in any MSS. of great antiquity in capital letters. We think it worth while to annex thoſe parts of Wetſtein's tract, which relate to this queſtion.

Sect. XXIV.

" Tandem, pari jure, ad codices vetuſtiſ-
" ſimos, decem et plura ſæcula ſuperantes,
" cordatè provoco; ac miror ἀβλεψίαν inſignem
" viri doctiſſimi, qui ad codices vetuſtiſſimos,
" nullis accentibus onuſtos, in bibliothecâ
" et Baſilienſi et Florentinâ extantes, nos
" ablegare haud veretur; cùm omnibus illius
" forulis excuſſis, ne unicum quidem folium,

" nedum codex integer MS. Græcus, ſine ac-
" centibus ibi reperiatur. Ad numerum ergo
" augendum hoc facit. Imó verò hîc extat
" codex IV. evangeliorum membranaceus,
" accentibus et ſpiritibus ubique ferè diſcre-
" tus, literiſque majuſculis, quales in vetuſ-
" tiſſimis codicibus, Pariſiis, Londini, Oxo-
" niæ, vidi ipſemet, exaratus; qui accentuum
" et ſpirituum veram figuram, et poſitionem
" antiquam ac genuinam, exhibet: apparent
" etiam paſſim apoſtrophi, accentus acutus
" et gravis paulò longiùs protrahuntur,
" quàm vulgo, in minutis characteribus, fieri
" ſolet; circumflexus ῀ v inverſi formam ubi-
" que refert; ſpiritus aſper hanc ⊢, lenis ve-
" rò iſtam, ⊣, figuram ubique obtinet; apo-
" ſtrophus ſemilunulæ inſtar habet". Appa-
" rent encliticarum vocum accentus trajecti,
" Luc. 24. 29. ΧΕΙΡΑ'CΜΟΥ; acutus in ἐσίν
" retractus Luc. 24. 6. ΟΥΚ Ε'CΤΙΝ, et multa
" alia veterum grammaticorum auctoritate
" introducta, et conſtanti obſervatione ad
" nos uſque propagata. De Florentinâ verò
" bibliothecâ cùm te, incomparabilis Ma-
" gliabechi, conſulerem, a viro, tum generis
" nobilitate, tum meritorum in rem litera-
" riam gloriâ, illuſtri, *Antonio Maria Sal-*
" *vinio*, abbate, et Græcarum literar. pro-
" feſſ.

" feſſ. meritiſſ. hoc beneficium impetrâſti;
" ut, inſigni labore in mei gratiam ſuſcepto,
" hæc ad me preſcripſerit: *Vetuſtiſſimos codi-*
" *ces Græcos, accentibus deſtitutos, quamvis*
" *omnes ampliſſimæ mediceæ bibliothecæ forulos*
" *in gratiam eruditiſſimi Wetſtenii excuſſerim,*
" *videre non contigit: duo reperiuntur codices*
" *Græci evangeliorum, majoribus ſeu quadratis*
" *literis exarati, in quibus non ſolùm gramma-*
" *tici, verùm etiam muſici apparent accentus.*
" Literarum et accentuum figuras, accura-
" tiſſimè et niditiſſimè depictas, unà tranſ-
" miſit vir humaniſſimus, cum noſtris pror-
" ſus convenientes, niſi quòd circumflexum,
" inſtar ſemicirculi paulò rotundiùs forma-
" tum, exhibeant ᾽. Quâ de re iterum
" præfatus vir Cl. *In codice vetuſtiſſimo poe-*
" *matis Græci, verſibus hexametris conſcripti,*
" *titulus legitur majuſculis literis, ſed cum*
" *accentibus*; ΜΑΝΕΘΩΝΟΣ ΑΠΟΤΕΛΕΣΜΑ-
" ΤΙΚΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΝ, *ubi circumflexum accen-*
" *tum, quemadmodum et in omnibus ferè codici-*
" *bus, obſervavi, non angulari ſpecie, ſed curvâ,*
" *ac penè ſemicirculi cujuſdam, deſcribi.* Quem
" typum vetuſtiſſimum Martianus Capella
" obſervavit, *inflexi* accentûs *ſignum dicens*
" *eſſe ſigma ſuper ipſas literas devexum* ᾽. In
" an-

" antiquo codice Martiani Capellæ MS. ibi-
" dem vir Cl. *tam Latinis quàm Græcis vocibus*
" *impoſitos vidit accentus.* Neque ſubſtitit hîc
" tua benevolentia, ampliſſime Magliabechi;
" ex ipsâ urbe Româ ſubſidia nobis, inſigni
" liberalitate viri, ſingulari humanitate ac
" eruditione pariter illuſtris, abbatis *Fabretti*,
" conquiſiviſti. Hic vir celeberrimus, quàm
" plurimis lapideis monumentis perluſtratis,
" tandem duo invenit Græcam inſcriptionem
" habentia; alterum ultra portam Salariam
" in vineâ nobb. de Burattis; alterum ad
" lævam viæ Appiæ, prope circum Gallieni,
" in vineâ Corteſiâ: inſcriptiones, diligen-
" tiſſimè depictas, cum apicibus non multis,
" nobis tranſmiſit vir doctiſſimus: apoſtrophi
" ibi rectè exprimuntur; apparent lineolæ
" accentus acutos et graves referentes, ſed
" non ſuo loco poſitæ. Unde ipſe vix exiſti-
" mo firmum inde argumentum deduci poſſe;
" niſi fortè indoctus lapicida grammaticos
" imperitè æmulari voluit. Sed à codicibus
" firmior nobis et certior eſt probatio; quia
" in iis commodè exarari et tutiùs conſervari
" hæ notæ potuerant. Itaque è bibliothecâ
" Vaticanâ duos, ſummæ vetuſtatis, codices
" præfatus illuſtris Fabrettus nobis detexit;
" alterum numero 1209. alterum numero
" 1522.

" 1522. notatum; illam verſionem LXX.
" interpretum, in polyglottis Anglicanis lau-
" datam, hunc evangelia exhibentem: ex
" utroque accepimus ἀποσπασμάτιον accen-
" tuum et ſpirituum, literis majuſculis im-
" poſitorum, figuram referens, exactiſſimè
" depictum; quæ cum Florentinis et noſtris
" ad amuſſim conveniunt. Leve autem eſt
" χρησφύφιον, *audaciam grammaticorum optimos*
" *veterum codices accentibus onerâſſe.* Id etſi
" de quibuſdam haud invitus conceſſerim,
" ſicut ipſe magne Magliabechi pandectis
" Florentinis accidiſſe nunciâſti; in cujus
" primis duabus paginis accentus literarum
" capitibus, ſed recentiore manu, ut cuilibet
" inſpicienti patere poſſit, ſunt appoſiti, cùm
" reliquæ paginæ faſtigiis ſint deſtitutæ: nec
" in epigrammate Græco, digeſtis præfixo,
" et accuratiſſimè delineato, ac mecum li-
" beraliſſimè communicato, ullum apicem,
" præter unicum apoſtrophum, deprehen-
" dere potui: attamen de omnibus MSS. id
" affirmare eſt temerarium. Nam in noſtro
" codice Baſilienſi cum literis accentus natos
" eſſe, non ſolùm docet priſca et genuina
" illa figura, à poſterioris ævi ſcriptoribus
" neglecta, ſed veſtigia vix ſæpe conſpicua,
" atramenti ſimilitudo, in apicibus et literis

" forma eadem: nec omnibus omninò voci-
" bus ſunt adjectæ; KAI omni caret notâ per
" totum codicem; ſæpe deeſt ſpiritus; inter-
" dum accentus: quod ſi cui codicem notare
" libuiſſet ad regulas grammaticorum, non
" ita obiter aut perfunctoriè id egiſſet. Pla-
" cuit deſcriptori ſuum ſequi genium."

Sect. XLIV.

" Provocamus pariter ad conſenſum uni-
" verſalem totius Græciæ, non imaginarium,
" ſed verum: adeat, cui lubet, bibliothecas
" inſtructiſſimas ubicunque terrarum; in-
" ſpiciat codices Græcos manuſcriptos, ante
" VI. VIII. X. XII. ſecula exaratos, qui ex
" toto oriente in occidentem delati fuere;
" reperiet in omnibus (quoad potiſſima)
" harmoniam admirabilem; videbit accen-
" tus eoſdem iiſdem vocibus appictos; de-
" prehendet in Homero, et priſcis auctori-
" bus, eandem varietatem, quam ſana an-
" tiquitas obſervavit. Nonne infallibile hoc
" eſt argumentum, accentuum doctrinam,
" et imponendi rationem, non à poſterio-
" rum ſeculorum doctoribus confictam, et
" in fraudem antiquitatis introductam, ſed
" potiùs ad conſervandam priſcam et genui-

" nam pronunciandi rationem, à doctiſſimis
" viris in ſcholis retentam et propagatam
" fuiſſe?"

The firſt ſix ſheets of this treatiſe were worked off, before this diſſertation of Wetſtein's fell, by mere accident, into the hands of the author.

We muſt correct an aſſertion, that we have made in the foregoing treatiſe, that no author has come forth from the preſs of either univerſity, without the accents. The unfortunate inſtance of the Oxford Theocritus had ſlipped from our memory. The example, it is to be hoped, will not be followed.

FINIS.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

16/101